Church of England

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
GIFT OF
A. S. Hallidie, Esq.
Received Sept 1885.
Accessions No. 27672 Shelf No.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/truechurchmenasc00overrich

THE

TRUE CHURCHMEN ASCERTAINED:

OR,

AN APOLOGY

FOR THOSE OF

The REGULAR CLERGY of the ESTABLISHMENT,

WHO ARE SOMETIMES CALLED

EVANGELICAL MINISTERS:

OCCASIONED BY

SEVERAL MODERN PUBLICATIONS.

By JOHN OVERTON, A. B.

LIBRARY

"Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh "you a reason of the hope that is in you." . . . . *St Peter.*

"We have in fact lost many of our people to Sectaries, by not "preaching in a manner sufficiently Evangelical; and we shall "neither recover them from the extravagancies into which they "have run, nor keep more from going over to them, but by "returning to the right way." . . . . . *Archbishop Secker.*

York.

Printed by T. WILSON and R. SPENCE, High Ouzgate.

Sold by J. MAWMAN, (successor to Mr. DILLY) Poultry, and F. & C. RIVINGTON, St. Paul's Church-yard, London; by WILSON and SPENCE, J. TODD, and J. WOLSTENHOLME, York; and by the Booksellers of Leeds, Hull, Durham, Halifax, Birmingham, Manchester, &c.

Anno 1801.

BX 5131
08

27672

PREFACE.

DID certain writers confine their ſtrictures to the peculiar doctrines and irregular procedure of *Sectaries*, as, to ſuperficial obſervers, they would ſeem to inſinuate, they might, doubtleſs, deſerve well of the Church of England, and of Chriſtianity in general. But, if, as a learned Prelate expreſſes himſelf, in their "over-abundant zeal to check the frenzy of the Methodiſts[a]," they involve under theſe ſtrictures many important doctrines of the Church of which they are Miniſters; if, as a late eminent Arch-Biſhop ſpeaks, they do ſuch ſectaries "the honour of miſcalling other perſons of more than ordinary ſerioufneſs by their *name*[b];" if, under certain reprobated and reproachful terms, they hold up to ridicule and contempt ſome of the moſt faithful adherents to this Church, their deſert is very different. And this they unqueſtionably do, in the judgment of the preſent Apologiſt.

There is, it muſt be confeſſed, an indiſtinctneſs, and a ſeeming affectation, in the *Title* under which ſuch Churchmen are here vindicated; but, as it is that under which, among others, they are accuſed; that which they are conſtantly charged with having "arrogated to themſelves[c];" and which, in reality, is, in ſome degree, characteriſtic of

(a) Biſhop Horſley's Charge, 1790, p. 25. (b) Secker's Ch. 1. p. 77 of Vol. vi. of Biſhop Watſon's Tracts. (c) See the Antijac. Review for April, 1799, p. 362, &c.; the ſame for May, 1799, p. 76; Eſſays by T. Ludlam, M. A; A Guide to the Church by the Rev. C. Daubeny, LL. B.; &c.

them; it may prevent circumlocution, and cannot be wholly unſuitable. There are conſiderations, indeed, which might be urged in expreſs defence of the Appellation. It might be ſuggeſted to the recollection of our Clerical Brethren, that the original commiſſion delivered to the Apoſtles of our Lord was, to "*preach the goſpel*[d];" that the authority deduced from hence, and given to us, by the Biſhop, at our ordination, expreſsly is, to "*preach the goſpel*[e];" and, that if our ſituation in any degree reſembles St. Paul's "*Woe* will *be unto* us *if* we *preach not the goſpel*[f]." It might be ſhown reaſonable to charge the invidiouſneſs of the diſtinction to *their* account whoſe conduct has rendered it neceſſary. At any rate, it might be fairly inquired, why there is more arrogance in this aſſumption, than in aſſuming *excluſively* the proud Title of "RATIONAL DIVINES[z]."

Be it known, however, to the writers in queſtion, and to all others who do not know it, that a large number of thoſe Miniſters whom, by *name* and *direct alluſion*, they claſs with Methodiſts, Enthuſiaſts, Fanatics, and Schiſmatics, are wholly unconſcious of affording any other cauſe for this treatment than a *ſtrict adherence to the vows of their Ordination*; that they equally reſpect, in their theory and their practice, the *doctrines* and the *conſtitution* of the eſtabliſhed Church; lament, moſt cordially, every occaſion, and every degree of deviation from her; and wiſh for nothing ſo much as her *preſervation in her genuine purity*. And for *theſe*, and *theſe* EXCLUSIVELY, under whatever Title they are found, it is the object of this work to apologize. This it is particularly requeſted, that the reader would fully underſtand, and conſtantly remember. Whatever may incidentally be ſaid of perſons guilty of *any ſpecies*

(d) Mark xvi. 15. (e) Ordination Service. (f) 1 Cor. ix. 16. (z) See Mr. Polwhele's Letter to Dr. Hawker, p. 55; Mr. Daubeny's Guide, p. 375; &c.

of irregularity, with whom these characters have been confounded, will only apply to them just so far as they adhere to this standard. And whoever puts any construction upon the book, contrary to this declaration, will wholly misrepresent and pervert it. Nor will the Work become responsible for the doctrines of any persons except those for whom by *name* it undertakes. Few, however, it is believed, will be found of the denomination and description in question, who will not cordially subscribe to their sentiments.

The Writer well knows how frequently it is insinuated, that professions of regard for the Church are wholly inconsistent with animadversions on the defects of so many of her Ministers. But, to answer in the words of a most sensible and celebrated female writer, on another occasion; "Surely an earnest wish to turn their attention to objects calculated to promote their true dignity, is not the office of an enemy. So to expose the weakness of the land, as to suggest the necessity of internal improvement, and to point out the means of effectual defence, is not *treachery*, but *patriotism* (g)." A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. The commencement of the nineteenth century is not a season when men can be hoodwinked respecting their religion. It is every way absurd to suppose that it is not *known* what are the real doctrines that we preach. And if, in fact, they are not such as we have solemnly and publicly engaged to teach, it will not soften the reproaches of our adversaries that we are dexterous at equivocation, and endeavour to huddle up the business among ourselves. But in truth, neither the existence, nor the proclamation of this defect in the doctrines of some of the Clergy, affords any *sufficient* ground for the enemies of the Establishment to triumph. However much it is to be lamented, it is only an *occasional* and a *partial* deviation from a constitution

(g) See Strictures on Education, by Hannah More, Introduction, p. 10.

fundamentally found; whereas, however our common Opponents may poſſeſs ſome *occaſional* rectitude, their various ſchemes, as the arguments of the learned and the experience of all ages have proved, are *radically* defective, and contain the principles of endleſs diviſions and confuſion, in their *very nature*.

The Divines, however, upon whoſe procedure the nature of the preſent undertaking renders it neceſſary to animadvert, are the *Aggreſſors*. They have attacked *perſonally* and by *name*, a number of Individuals, who had taken no ſuch liberty with them. They, therefore, at any rate, cannot reaſonably find fault. And, from among ſuch of their coadjutors as have fallen under the writer's obſervation, it may be proper alſo to mention, that they have generally been ſelected on account of their reſpectability. Nor is it the Writer's intention, that a ſingle paſſage ſhould be applied to any Divine who does not *profeſſedly* hold the doctrines advanced in their works; or, that they ſhould be reſponſible for the doctrines of each other, any further than they *profeſſedly* agree. He therefore who poſſeſſes the "Mens conſcia recti," will neither be injured nor diſmayed.

There are many, very many, ſerious and worthy miniſters in the Church, it is believed, who do not adopt the language, and claſs themſelves in the ranks, of the characters here defended; who nevertheleſs, acknowledge their doctrines to be thoſe of the Articles; approve of theſe doctrines in their hearts; and are only deterred from more frequently dwelling upon them by the dread of incurring an *odious name*[z]. Is it ſaid, that the boundary of ſimple defence has been too far exceeded, and that too much has been done *offenſively*? Our late great Premier's Apology, under a ſimilar reprehenſion, is full in point; a perſuaſion that nothing would ſo effectually contribute towards an

(z) See below, Ch. ix. beginning of Concluſion.

honourable and a lasting peace, as a reformation of the Antagonist's principles.

Another thing of which the writer is aware is, his own incompetency to do justice to the subject. Many, he doubts not, will exclaim on the occasion "Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis Tempus eget." Others, he foresees, among his elder brethren, will be even angry at the attempt, and will certainly represent it as impertinent and presumptuous. He must however be indulged in believing, that such is the clearness of the cause, to the extent to which it is here pursued, that the meanest advocate, who engages in it, can scarcely fail, in some degree, to advance it. There is no pretension to any novelty of argument. Although not, perhaps, precisely under its present form, the question has, in effect, been discussed too often to admit of this, whoever may undertake it. But it by no means follows, that hence it is useless to advance any thing upon the subject. There is much wisdom in the observation of the late eminent Mr. Burke; "Let us only suffer any person to tell us his story, morning and evening, but for one twelve-month, and he will become our master [k]." And who, except those to whom the business is familiar, hears only the pleadings of one party in a court of judicature, and is not generally inclined to become his partisan? The clamour therefore which is now raised upon the subject in question [l], and the frequent repetition of the old arguments on one side of the case, will justify the repetition of a few particulars on the opposite side, in the minds of all who really desire that the issue may be according to truth.

Nor is a reply wholly wanting to other parts of the objection which this regard to the "an liceat, an deceat,

(k) Quoted in the Antijacobin Review for July, 1798, p. 58.
(l) See the writings of Dr. Croft, Mr. T. Ludlam, Mr. Clapham, Mr. Daubeny, Mr. Polwhele, the Antijacobin Review, &c. &c.

an expediat," may ſuggeſt. Many inſtances might be adduced, in which, as the great Dr. Johnſon obſerves, they "who form the baſe of the pyramid of ſubordination, and lie buried in obſcurity themſelves, ſupport all that is ſplendid, conſpicuous, or exalted [m]." No perſon however who has ſubſcribed to the doctrines of our Church, and is an appointed public teacher of theſe doctrines, ſhould be ſuppoſed *wholly ignorant* of their nature. Or, to ſay the leaſt, in this land of perfect liberty, no perſon is too inſignificant to aſſign the reaſons for his conduct, when he finds himſelf implicated in a public cenſure. This privilege will eſpecially be allowed him, when, as in the preſent caſe, the charge is a ſerious one, which affects, at once, his underſtanding and his integrity, his reputation and his intereſt; when ſuch charge is made very notorious, and reiterated with great confidence, as a fact that is unqueſtionable; and when, after a very careful inquiry, he firmly believes there is no foundation for it whatever; but that, as a ſpecies of king's evidence, the accuſers themſelves are the real offenders.

Of one claſs of readers, the writer ſolicits candour; of another, he demands juſtice. Thoſe who have aſſumed the immediate office of giving a verdict on ſuch occaſions, it will be found, are deeply *intereſted* in the buſineſs. They therefore, according to the ordinary courſe of juſtice, are incapacitated for being heard; or, at the moſt, they can only give a ſort of "ex parte" evidence. Thoſe of them however, although intereſted, may be expected to act honourably whoſe *main and profeſſed object* it is to expoſe the UNFAIRNESS OF REVIEWERS [n].

The *manner* in which the ſubject is here treated, is as old-faſhioned, as the doctrine which is defended. A leading characteriſtic of this is, to advance nothing without

---

(m) Rambler, Vol. iii. p. 225. Ed. 12. (n) See the Proſpectus to the Antijacobin Review, and that to the Britiſh Critic.

PROOF; to claim credit for nothing which is not either founded in argument, or ſupported by teſtimony; and, in the uſe of this teſtimony, to admit nothing at *ſecond hand*; but to bring forward the vouchers to ſpeak for themſelves; or at the leaſt, to ſpecify their names, and characters, and places of abode. This, it muſt be confeſſed, is a proceſs which, beſides being unfaſhionable, is liable to many ſerious objections and inconveniences. Who knows not how much more difficult it is to *prove* than barely to *affirm*, almoſt the plaineſt matter? Who ſees not the drudgery and tedioufneſs of ſuch a procedure, and the awkward appearance of the margin which it occaſions? And how ſhall all this be endured? How much more eaſy and compendious a method of treating an opponent it is, to claſs him, at once, with perſons whoſe principles or characters are generally obnoxious, with whom he may happen to hold ſome things in common; and conſtantly to aſſail him with their *abſurdities!* How much more ſimple a proceſs it is, to get furniſhed with a few *indefinite terms of abuſe*, which, as the late excellent Biſhop Horne affirms of them, "always ſignify what the impoſers pleaſe to mean, and the people to hate;" and with theſe, as with a ſort of magic, to overwhelm him at a ſtroke!

Tedious, however, as the mode of inveſtigation here adopted is, in *queſtions of fact*, of which kind the preſent inquiry muſt chiefly be conſidered, the wiſdom of ages has diſcovered no method ſo certain for arriving at truth. And really, there is no end of regarding what angry opponents *merely affirm* of each other. On this plan, the chief of the Apoſtles may be repreſented as "*mad*;" and Chriſt himſelf charged with *immorality* and *obnoxious connections*[o]. Nor do ſheer vulgar prejudices, ſuppoſitions that thoſe who differ from us, in religious opinion, are a kind of monſters in the creation, at all change their nature whether they proceed

(o) See Matt. xi. 19, and Acts xxvi. 24.

from the "great vulgar" or the ſmall; from the chair of ſome learned ſeminary, or from that of the nurſing-room.

The method here purſued affords alſo the beſt ſecurity againſt the *iniquity of quotation itſelf.* It is, "prima facie," a pledge of the writer's fairneſs, as removing all hope that diſhoneſty would remain undetected. It affords eaſy means of examination and ſatisfaction to thoſe who are doubtful. It is indeed ſcarcely poſſible not, ſometimes, to miſunderſtand, and of courſe, to miſrepreſent an author. It is ſtill leſs poſſible to avoid the imputation of this conduct; becauſe, when placed, however juſtly, in a ſituation that is unpleaſant to him, a diſingenuous writer will deny his own doctrine, and equivocate even with himſelf. In what is here given as quotation, the *words* of the author are carefully diſtinguiſhed [z]. For the juſtneſs of what he is ſaid to teach in effect, to inſinuate, intimate, &c. the places referred to muſt anſwer. No ſtreſs is laid on mere criticiſms on the meaning of a few doubtful words; nothing is founded on conſequences deduced from the opponent's doctrines, which he can fairly deny. Whatever is not proved by a whole body of evidence, rendered ſtrong and invincible by the harmony and ſupport of all its parts, and interpreted as it would be by plain honeſt men of ſound underſtandings and ſufficient information, ſhall be conſidered as not proved at all. It is therefore eſpecially deſired, that, on one part, and on the other, regard may be had to no UNSUPPORTED CHARGE; and that, "*with what meaſure* we *mete*, *it* may *be meaſured to* us *again* [p]."

The *Churchmanſhip* of the perſons under vindication being aſcertained, a few things are offered on behalf of the

---

(z) In a few inſtances, the perſon, or tenſe, or an inſignificant word for the ſake of the connection, is altered, or the antecedent is put for the relative, but never (errors excepted) where ſuch change, can poſſibly affect the argument.

(p) Mat. vii. 2.

CHURCH, and in *defence* of her genuine doctrines. That particular is fixed upon, and discussed at large, in regard for which, the chief prejudices against the rest of these doctrines, and their abettors, are pretended to be entertained; namely, the doctrine of *Good-Works*, or *Christian Morality*. Hence, it is intended to appear, that the characters in question, are *true Churchmen* of a *true Church*, and therefore worthy of the Title, in the highest sense. And if, in reality, this feeble effort should contribute to this end; if, through the blessing of God, it should, in any measure, cause the true principles of the Establishment to be more respected; if, in any degree, it should render it a *more creditable thing* to preach the *real doctrines* of the Church *in the Church*, the labour of the writer would be rewarded abundantly. This, he is confident, would be productive of proportionable good, to both Church and State. For, without arraigning the principles of those who think otherwise, as *intentionally* bad, *only in the faithful promulgation of these doctrines* can he see any effectual opposition to the present alarming progress of Infidelity and Profligacy; and only in the promulgation of them *in strict conformity to the established plan*, can he expect any good effects of the Pulpit, that are sober, general, and permanent; and that are not counteracted by a nearly proportionable degree of disorder and mischief.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

The main question stated; and argued against the Assailants, from their CONDUCT IN SUBSCRIPTION,—*their* OWN CONCESSIONS,—*and the* COMPLAINTS OF SEVERAL EMINENT BISHOPS. . . . . *Page* 13

CHAP. II.

The REAL SENSE OF THE ARTICLES, AND DOCTRINES OF OUR REFORMERS, *investigated, and appealed to, on the question.* 44

SECTION I.

The true interpretation sought, from our DIFFERENT FORMS *as they illustrate and explain each other; the* TITLE *and* PREAMBLE *annexed to the articles; the* CIRCUMSTANCES *and* OBJECT *of our Reformers; their* OTHER PUBLIC *and* APPROVED WRITINGS; *and the* AUTHORITIES *they respected.* 44

SECTION II.

The true interpretation of the articles further sought from the known PRIVATE SENTIMENTS *of our Reformers.* 69

CHAP. III.

An examination whose teaching most resembles that of our Church and her Reformers, in respect to, the USE *made of the peculiar doctrines of the gospel, and the neceſsity of* PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY. . . . . *Page* 100

CHAP. IV.

The inquiry pursued with regard to the doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN, *and the consequent* STATE AND CHARACTER OF MAN, *in this world,* AS A SINNER. 128

CHAP. V.

The investigation continued with respect to the doctrine of REPENTANCE. 160

CHAP. VI.

The question prosecuted with regard to the doctrine of JUSTIFICATION. 178

CHAP. VII.

The question of adherence pursued in respect to the doctrine of GOOD WORKS; *with a vindication of our tenets on this head.* 220

SECTION I.

Concerning the STANDARD *of Morals.* 221

SECTION II.

Concerning the SANCTIONS *of Morality.* 273

SECTION III.

A vindication of certain INDIVIDUALS; *an appeal to* EXPERIENCE, *and to the* CONCESSIONS *of our opponents, on the point; and a conclusion that it is the* STRICTNESS *of our morality which gives the offence.* 306

CHAP. VIII.

The REASONS *of our adherence to the genuine doctrines of the Church of England stated; and a general* APOLOGY *for her doctrines.* 333

CHAP. IX

The RECAPITULATION *and* CONCLUSION. . . . 389

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE TRUE CHURCHMEN &c.

CHAPTER I.

The main question stated; and argued against the Assailants, from their CONDUCT IN SUBSCRIPTION,—*their* OWN CONCESSIONS,—*and the* COMPLAINTS OF SEVERAL EMINENT BISHOPS.

OUR first object shall be to state fully in what the matter at issue consists. We will begin with an extract from a pamphlet entitled "Thoughts concerning the Methodists and the established Clergy; by George Croft, D. D." In this pamphlet the Doctor expresses himself thus: "*They alone, if we believe themselves, have adhered to the doctrines of the articles, homilies, and liturgy. This,* he proceeds, *is gross misrepresentation.* THEY *taught* MORE *than these doctrines, and* WE *teach them as they were first delivered by our Reformers* [a]."—Now that Dr. Croft includes under this censure persons of the description specified in our preface, those who are guilty of *no species of irregularity*, but who, as they conceive, in *all* things, adhere strictly to the rules of the establishment, is beyond a question. He alludes expressly, in this same pamphlet, to Mr. Milner, to the Minister of "the New Church," and *all* the ministers, except "one Individual," then [z] in the churches, at Hull; to Dr. Coulthurst, his Curate, and those "who are anticipating appointments to the Chapels in his parish;" to Mr. Romaine; and to *all* for whom presentations have been procured "by a noble Earl, and some gentlemen of opulence"; and, with equal explicitness, alludes to them as "fanatical Divines," "clerical Enthusiasts," "pretended Favourites of heaven [b]." &c.

(a) Page 19. (z) 1795. (b) P. 14, 29, 31.

The same, however, in effect, with the above proposition of Dr. Croft, is the language of Mr. Polwhele [e], Mr. Haggitt [z], and a whole tribe of modern writers on this subject. Whatever different objects these gentlemen have immediately in view, or however more or less sparing they are in the mention of individuals, or in epithets of reproach, directly or indirectly, their censures uniformly involve the characters in question; and their reasonings obviously proceed on the supposition that the rest of the clergy DO, and that these persons DO NOT, teach according to the established doctrines of our Church.

This, in effect, is the proposition maintained by Mr. Daubeny, and his admirers, against the well-known objects of his strictures, Mr. Wilberforce and Mrs. More. The opinion Mr. W. has expressed [f] respecting the difference between the *actual* and the *professed* principles of many of the clergy, Mr. D. says is "unjust," and "derived more from the indecent revilings of irregular preachers than from fact [g]." To other parts of this publication Mr. D. has "thought it necessary to object as more favourable to *enthusiasm* than practical Christianity [h]." In his Letter to Mrs. More, after quoting the words of both Mrs. M. and Mr. Wilberforce respecting the 'union between the doctrines and duties of Christianity,' he observes, "But, Madam, this is not the language either of the Scripture, or of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND [i]." And then, having stated his own opposite notions on the point, "THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND," he adds, "teaches the same doctrine [k]." Accordingly, "If," his panegyrist observes, "Mrs. More be really of Mr. Wilberforce's school, her faith, like his, is Calvinism in disguise; and *her attachment to the church of England*, of a very questionable kind. [l]" "Those who are,

(e) Letters to Dr. Hawker. (z) See a visitation Sermon preached at Cambridge, June 1799. by the Rev. John Haggitt, B. D. Fellow of Clare Hall, and Vicar of Madingley. (f) Practical View &c. p. 408 (g) Guide to the Church, p. 324. 378. (h) Ibid. 313. (i) p. 39. (k) Ibid. p. 40. (l) Antijac. Rev. Nov. 1799. p. 255.

distinguished GOSPEL-MINISTERS," Mr. Daubeny says, "should rather be called preachers of absolute decrees, predestination, election, and faith without works [m]." And, in short, to prove the *heresy* of persons of this description, and his *own churchmanship*, he has favoured the world with several volumes.

Nor must we view in any other light the Essays of Thomas Ludlam, A. M. He also refers us to the Articles and Reformers; not indeed frequently; but, as the "Rector of Foston," he can scarcely object to this standard of doctrine. The object of this writer's more immediate attack is Mr. Robinson, the author of the "Scripture Characters [n]." A portion of his reproof and correction is, however, extended to Mr. Hervey, Mr. Milner, Mr. Venn, Dr. Hawker, Dr. Knox, Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Scott of the Lock, and, as he expresses it, "the *whole tribe* of those who call themselves *serious Divines* and *Gospel-Ministers* [z], and whom the world not unfrequently calls *Methodists* [o]." And what renders this stricture more deserving of notice is, that the part of it contained in Mr. L.'s four Essays is commended by the respectable British Critic, whose professed object it is to protect the genuine doctrines of the church [p]. Mr. Ludlam it is said, "dissects with justice" the work of Mr. R. and "finds in it the seeds of many opinions, which he censures as unsound, and as belonging to the principles of Methodism [q]; &c."—Correspondent also with this decision, is the sentiment discovered by this Critic, in his Review of Mr. Scott's Thanksgiving Sermon [r].

But what is perhaps not less to be lamented, our admired political friends, the Antijacobin Reviewers, have classed this description of Divines with Heretics and Schismatics.

(m) Appendix to Guide, p. 622. (n) See Title page of "Four Essays, &c." (z) Mr. L. seems to use this appellation as synonimous with "Calvinistical Divines." See four Essays, p. 59. and note. (o) Four Essays p. 44, and passim; and Six Essays. (p) See the Prospectus, &c. (q) For April 798. p. 400.
(y) See British Critic, June 1799.

We can however readily forgive them. Engaged as they are in suppressing the Hydra of Jacobinism, it is no wonder, if they cannot always bestow a sufficient attention upon other matters. We wot, that through something they have observed in the Metropolis, where, perhaps, in some instances, order is not sufficiently regarded; or through the representation of some angry but ill-informed correspondents, they have done it.—It is however to be hoped, that without any relaxation of their vigilance, or any suppression of *just* suspicions, this Corps de garde will learn to distinguish their Allies from the Enemy; and hence, cease to play their artillery upon a large body of men who are both as *zealous Antijacobins*, and as *sincere Antischismatics*, as themselves.

Their manner of speaking on the subject, however, exactly coincides with what has been already advanced. "These Gospel-ministers," they say, "as their followers are instructed to call them, upbraid the clergy of our church with not preaching the whole counsel of God. We boldly reply to such a charge, that the sound and orthodox divines, of whom there are thousands in England, firmly believe, and frequently preach, as pure and true doctrines, those contained in the 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th Articles of our faith[r]." "These teachers," they say again, "pride themselves as being the only true members of the church of England, who adopt the faith contained in her Articles and Homilies, &c. . . . But let us examine what these schismatics mean by their church of England. . . . Let us investigate the fundamental principles on which they pretend to ground their superiority over their nominal brethren[s]."—These they represent to be holding election, talking of experience, vital knowledge, and feeling, in respect to salvation; notions of which they wholly disapprove[o]: Or, to adduce the words of their correspondent, "It would be easy," it is said, "to prove that those who arrogate to themselves exclusively the title of Evangelical preachers, are not true members of the

(r) April 1799. p. 368. (s) Ibid. p. 362—368. (o) Ibid.

Church of England in DOCTRINE[t]." They mention expreſsly, as belonging to, or abettors of, this claſs of Miniſters, Romaine, Cecil, Cadogan, Goode, Scott, Wilberforce, More[z], &c. &c.

It is now pretty clear then, both who are the parties, and what is the matter, really in debate. And, however trite our ſubject may be, we are not, it appears, about to contend with a ſhadow. The Evangelical Teachers, of the deſcription here ſpecified, certainly *do* pretend to adhere ſtrictly to the Doctrines of the Church, and *thus generally* is their claim denied, and the oppoſite one ſupported.

The QUESTION therefore is, whoſe pretenſions, in this matter, are beſt founded? WHOSE DOCTRINES ARE REALLY THOSE OF OUR ARTICLES, HOMILIES, AND LITURGY? WHO, IN REALITY, TEACH THE DOCTRINES CONTAINED IN THESE FORMULARIES, AS THEY WERE FIRST DELIVERED BY OUR REFORMERS?—This is the queſtion now to be inveſtigated. It is doubtleſs a queſtion of importance. Let us therefore diveſt ourſelves of prejudice, and meet it fairly. In the words of our opponents, "Litera ſcripta manet[v]."—Under the reſtrictions then, and with a view to the purpoſes, ſpecified in our preface, we proceed.

2. Now, that the *actual opinions and teaching* of many in the Church do not coincide with the *expreſs and obvious doctrines* of our Articles, appears, from their CONDUCT RESPECTING SUBSCRIPTION to theſe Articles, and the methods they have recourſe to in order to reconcile themſelves to this meaſure.

We deſign not here to recapitulate the names, and exhibit the hiſtory, of thoſe Miniſters of the Eſtabliſhment, who at *other periods* have complained of ſubſcription as a burden; propoſed their various ſchemes of amendment; or openly ſolicited a reformation[w]. This however, were it neceſſary

(t) May 1799, p. 76. (z) See Note (s); and Antijac. for Auguſt 1799, p. 452; September, p. 34; October, p. 195; November, p. 255, and 258 and 339. (v) Ibid. April, 1799. p. 362. (w) See the Arian and Bangorian controverſies on the ſubject; the Confeſſional, &c.

on the occaſion, might be done with propriety, and with effect; and the circumſtance ought not to be forgotten. But our attention ſhall be confined to *modern* Divines, and to thoſe authors which they recommend, and which are therefore in modern uſe and eſtimation.

By ſome then, the Articles of our church are conſidered as little more than ARTICLES OF PEACE, which are only *not to be contradicted* in our public miniſtrations; as mere proſcriptions of certain ſects and tenets which obtained at our firſt ſeparation from Rome, and therefore *unmeaning* and *obſolete* in proportion as theſe particular ſects and tenets have ceaſed to be dangerous; as "a mere form of admiſſion into the church [x]"; or, denominate them what they pleaſe, a ſomething which does not require from the Miniſter who ſubſcribes them, the *actual belief* of the doctrines they contain.

Under this claſs may be mentioned, as a ſpecimen, the learned Biſhop Watſon. Addreſſing his clergy upon the nature of the Chriſtian doctrines, "I think it ſafer," he ſays, "to tell you *where* they are contained, than *what* they are. They are contained in the bible; and if, in the reading of that book, your ſentiments concerning the doctrines of Chriſtianity ſhould be *different* from thoſe of your neighbour, or *from thoſe of the Church*, be perſuaded, on your part, that infallibility appertains as little to you, as it does to the church.... Towards the church you ought to preſerve reverence and reſpect; and in your *public teaching*, you ought not, whilſt you continue a miniſter in it, to *diſturb the public peace by oppoſition* to its doctrines [y]." And having recommended charity towards "individuals, of whatever denomination of Chriſtians they may be," "If," his Lordſhip adds, "you do this, your *diſcordance of opinion* will be attended with *no miſchief* public or private [z]."

To the ſame effect, but more ſtrongly, ſpeaks the eminent Dr. Thomas Balguy [a]. "We are not obliged," he ſays,

(x) See Britiſh Critic for Dec. 1799. p. 610. (y) Charge, 95. p. 65.
(z) Ibid. (a) Late Archdeacon and Prebendary of Wincheſter.

"I conceive, in our diſcourſes from the pulpit, either to explain or defend *every* particular doctrine ſet forth in the articles of religion: . . . But we are far from being at liberty to ſay all we pleaſe. Every word that comes from our mouths *in oppoſition* to the eſtabliſhed faith, is a violation of the moſt ſolemn engagements. . . . I ſay nothing againſt the right of private judgment: againſt freedom of thought, or freedom of ſpeech. *I only contend* that men ought not to *attack the Church from thoſe very pulpits*, in which they were placed for her defence [b]." In *other places*, he would not "diſcourage the clergy of the eſtabliſhed church from thinking for themſelves, or from *ſpeaking*, or even from *writing*, what they think[z]." "Some perſons," he ſays again, "care not to diſtinguiſh between terms of ſalvation, and terms of admiſſion to the miniſtry. The following paſſage from Clarke's Reply to Nelſon, p. 32. will perhaps give them a juſter idea of the nature and end of ſubſcription. 'Particular churches require men's aſſent to, and uſe of, certain forms of words; not as the *rule of their faith*, but as *prudential means of uniformity*, and of preventing diſorder and confuſion among themſelves [c].'"

Archdeacon Paley's notions are full to our purpoſe. "Thoſe" he obſerves, "who contend that nothing leſs can juſtify ſubſcription to the 39 Articles than the *actual belief* of each and every ſeparate propoſition they contain, muſt ſuppoſe that the legiſlature expected the conſent of ten thouſand men, and that in perpetual ſucceſſion, not to one controverted propoſition, but to many hundreds. It is hard to conceive how this could be expected by any, who obſerve the incurable diverſity of human opinion upon all ſubjects ſhort of demonſtration. If the authors of the law did not intend this, what did they intend? 1. To exclude from offices in the church, all abettors of Popery. 2. Anabaptiſts, who were at that time a powerful party on the continent. 3. The Puritans, who were hoſtile to the epiſcopal conſtitution; and in general the members of ſuch leading

(b) Diſcourſe 7. p. 118—120. (z) Ibid. (c) Charge 5. p. 268. Note.

ſects or foreign eſtabliſhments, as threatened to overthrow our own. Whoever finds himſelf comprehended *within theſe deſcriptions*, ought *not* to ſubſcribe[d]." *All others* then, it ſhould ſeem, of whatever name or creed, may conſcientiouſly ſubſcribe. And thoſe candidates for orders in the church who will now find themſelves comprehended amongſt the abettors of Popery, the Puritans, or Anabaptiſts, will ſcarcely be numerous.

If this mode of repreſenting the ſubject does not diſpenſe with the neceſſity of *any particular creed* in order to honeſt ſubſcription, and render the articles in a great meaſure *obſolete*, it is clearly the Archdeacon's wiſh that this *ſhould* be done. "During the preſent ſtate of eccleſiaſtical patronage," he ſays, "*ſome* limitation of the patron's choice may be neceſſary to prevent unneceſſary contentions; . . . but this danger, if it exiſt, may be provided againſt with equal effect, by converting the articles of faith into *articles of peace*[e]." His ideas on the ſubject are further illuſtrated, when he ſays of eſtabliſhed "Creeds and Confeſſions" in general, that "they are at all times attended with ſerious inconveniences;" that "they check inquiry, violate liberty, and enſnare the conſciences of the clergy[f];" and when he ſo ſtrongly objects to the doctrines of the church being "woven with ſo much induſtry into her forms of public worſhip[g]."

Mr. Giſborne, accordingly, underſtood the Doctor to "intimate that ſubſcription can be juſtified *without an actual belief* of each of the articles;" and conſidered it "a gratuitous aſſumption[h]." So alſo he is underſtood by the Antijacobin reviewers. Having obſerved that "whenever a reference is made to the "animus imponentis" in ſubſcription, for the *doctrine*, it muſt be made to the "*framers* of the articles, for the *law* to the *enactors*;" "this diſtinction," they add,

(d) Moral and Phil. p. 180—182. 4to. (e) Ibid. (f) Ibid. p. 568. (g) Moral and Polit. Philoſ. chap. on forms of Prayer in Public Wor. p. 66. 8vo. (h) Moral Philoſophy, chap. on Promiſes.

"sweeps away at once all that rubbish of reasoning, with which Dr. Paley particularly would *justify subscription without belief*[i]." Mr. Polwhele quotes him as *saying expressly*, after the mention of 'abettors of popery, anabaptists, and puritans,' "*These three* denominations of persons, therefore, ought not to subscribe the 39 Articles: but *all others may*[k]." This, however, although it may seem foreign to our purpose to notice it, is both a false quotation, and a plain misrepresentation, of Dr. Paley. Mr. Polwhele *wholly omits* the clause "and in general, &c.[l]" which follows the particulars that are enumerated. Nor does "the Archdeacon *say*" what is here given as *his words*.

To *Dr. Paley*, however, thus interpreted, with one other writer[z], Mr. P. refers, as a most satisfactory answer to the charge of deviation from the plain meaning of the articles; "*such a reply as must satisfy every man, who is neither an* ENTHUSIAST, *nor a* HYPOCRITE[m]."

It is surely a little unfortunate (we cannot but here remark by the way) that what Mr. Polwhele thus considers *so satisfactorily decisive*, his great admirers, the Antijacobin Reviewers, consider as arrant "rubbish of reasoning," sheer jesuitism, a mere opening for "Arians and Socinians!" Commenting upon the very same passage, amidst much to the like effect, "Such," they exclaim, "is the confusedness of Dr. P.'s ideas here, and such the contradictoriness of his language! A more gross, more palpable, more massy instance occurs not, perhaps in any other author whatever[n]!" We will not apply to these gentlemen the appellations, which, according to Mr. Polwhele, may seem to belong to them, for this dissatisfaction with his author. They however could extol Mr. P.'s attack upon the very Divine he is here combating, as "not more remarkable for its strength than its justice;" and "strenuously recommend it to the perusal of our regular clergy[o]!"

(i) January 1800. p. 19. (k) 2nd Letter to Dr. Hawker, p. 22. (l) See above p. 19. (z) Bishop Burnet. (m) 2nd Letter, p. 22. (n) January 1800. p. 19—21. (o) Review of Letters to Dr. H. August 1799. p. 452. September 1799, p. 101.

But, to return to our argument. What may ſeem a little extraordinary, the Conductors of the Britiſh Critic approve of Dr. Paley's method of treating this ſubject of ſubſcription to the Articles. "We avow our ſatisfaction," they ſay, "in the *liberal* (not ſlimſy and unprincipled," as their author had ſtyled them) "arguments, adduced by the Archdeacon in his explanatory obſervations on the duty of ſubſcribers to that teſt of faith. . . . We feel ourſelves, and we think the whole Chriſtian community greatly obliged to that Gentleman for favouring the public with his *rational, judicious, and enlarged ſentiments* on this head, and we hope they will, as they ought, have a due effect upon every reflecting, unprejudiced, mind[p]."

By *another claſs* of theſe Divines, it is *acknowledged*, or all but acknowledged, that the eſtabliſhed Confeſſions have actually experienced what they call, a TACIT REFORMATION. Theſe perſons repreſent our formularies of doctrine as having "a new and acquired ſenſe;" and maintain, that in this ſenſe they are conſcientiouſly ſubſcribed, *however different* it may be from their *literal and primitive meaning*.

A leading patron of this ſcheme is the celebrated Dr. Powel, late Archdeacon of Colcheſter, and Maſter of St. John's College Cambridge. Thus, in a diſcourſe expreſsly on the ſubject, preached before the Univerſity, and entitled "A defence of the ſubſcriptions required in the Church of England," we find ſuch declarations and reaſonings as the following: Speaking of the Articles, he ſays, "as *new diſcoveries* have ſprung up, NEW EXPLANANIONS have been gradually framed and adapted to them; and almoſt every commentator has added ſomething to the common ſtock. And if, among this great variety, a free inquirer ſhould not find all his own opinions, the ſame liberty of adding to it ſtill remains[q]." This is admitting, in plain terms, no ſmall part of our queſtion. "We are not," he ſays expreſsly, "concerned to diſcover what was *meant* by

(p) February, 1796. p. 146. (q) Diſ. 2. p. 39.

the *writers*, but what will be understood by the *readers*. ... I will not," he proceeds, "add by those who require the declaration; not by the governors of the church; ... not by the legislature; ... but by the general voice of learned men through the nation[r]." "Such words," it is added, "as were originally determinate, by length of time and change of circumstances may become ambiguous. Custom can take away the force of expressions, or give them a *new meaning*. ... Nor are these *changes of the sense* unusual, even in our most solemn forms, the scriptures[s]."

On this ground, the Doctor vindicates his brethren, against the charge of departure from the meaning of the Articles. "The accusation," he says, "is not only false, but the crime impossible. That cannot be the sense of the declaration which no one imagines to be the sense; nor can that interpretation be erroneous which all have received. With whatever violence it was at first introduced, yet possession is always a sufficient title. .... It is sufficient to justify the use of any explanation, that it has been openly declared, and not generally condemned. And therefore when an article has been understood, by good and learned interpreters, in a sense, neither the *most obvious*, nor the *most usual*; he who assents to it, is at liberty to follow their guidance, or to join himself to the multitude[t]." "Upon the whole," he observes, "it appears, that we may understand the established doctrines in *any* of those senses which the general words comprehend, or to which the *received interpretation* of these doctrines, or the judgment of able interpreters, have extended them: and that we may allow ourselves, if it seems necessary, to *differ as much* from former interpreters, as they have frequently done from each other[u]." Nay, he almost doubts, whether they can now be conscientiously understood in their obvious and primitive signification. "Where," he says, "the *original* sense is one, the *received* another, the subscriber

(r) Page 35. (s) p. 37. (t) P. 38. (u) p. 42.

is at liberty to uſe them in either. That he may underſtand them in their moſt obvious and primitive ſignification, will ſcarce be doubted; and yet if *there is any place for doubt*, it *can only be here*[w].'' All this is adhering to the ſenſe of th reformers with a witneſs!

But the notion of this "new and acquired ſenſe" appears to have obtained its higheſt plauſibility, and received its greateſt ſupport, from the learned Dr. Hey. This Divine as Norriſian Profeſſor of Divinity at Cambridge, whoſe lectures, in many caſes, it is neceſſary to attend as a qualification for Orders[x], has illuſtrated and defended ſuch a method of interpretation with great labour and ingenuity. And, the reſult of his atchievements ſeems to amount to ſomething like this:

That "forms" may be "left in *words*, but *taken away*, or *altered* in *meaning*," in which caſe, "it may be either ſaid, that they grow *obſolete*, or that the law which injoins them is *tacitly repealed*; . . . that a *tacit* repeal is of equal validity with an *expreſs* one;" that while theſe forms remain the ſame, "it is poſſible to conceive ſuch a ſeries of improvements, that *all* the laws enjoining forms ſhould be (thus tacitly) repealed;" that "in this caſe, there would be a *perfect liberty*;" and that all this would be "*ſtrictly defenſible and right*[y]:" In other words, "that a *tacit* reformation might be *total*;" that as "*each part* might become obſolete, *every part* might become ſo; or at leaſt *every diſtinguiſhing* part:" that "in this caſe, a religious ſociety would *change its doctrines*, and yet *retain the expreſſions* by which they were defined:" or, that "at the ſame time that *one ſociety* did this, another might adhere to the *old ſenſe* of the forms;" and that then "there would be *two religious ſocieties*, diſſenting from each other, yet uſing the *ſame articles* of faith;" that there may be "*two*

(w) Ibid. p. 37. (x) See the Biſhop of Durham's Ch. 1792, Ed. 2. p. 61.; and the Biſhop of London's, 1790, p. 34. (y) Norriſian Lectures, Vol. 2. p. 50—53. N. B. The quotations from Dr. Hey are all from theſe Lectures.

different Churches of England, using the *same forms*;" that one "might be called the *present* church," the other "the *antiquated* church;" that "each party may be sincere;" that "in each the minister may assent in the sense in which he is *understood* to assent, by those whom *he accounts* the most judicious[z]."

It is not affirmed that this is the actual state of things here. We are referred to the church of Geneva to see the "suppositions exemplified[a]." Nay, a caution is suggested "that every thing that is said be not applied, or thought applicable, to the articles of the Church of England in particular[b]." It is however a little remarkable that Dr. Hey's *supposed* case should be precisely that which it is our object to prove a *real* one; that his *two* churches should be formed by "those who have been commonly called *Methodists* among us . . . understanding parts of our articles in a *literal* sense, which *others* of the clergy assent to in a *different* sense[c]."

It is worthy of remark also, with what apparent approbation the learned Professor explains the reasoning of Dr. Powell, which is founded on the admission of the deviation in question. On the doubt expressed by the Archdeacon, whether the articles can now be understood in their obvious and primitive signification, Dr. Hey comments thus: "This may mean, common men will scarce doubt, that a man speaks truth, who speaks according to the literal sense; but those, who have considered the nature of veracity and of *tacit reformations*, will see, that a man, by speaking according to the literal sense, may speak falsehood[d]." This system of interpretation is illustrated from the 74th Canon of our church. Hence, it is concluded, "it appears, First, that a *tacit reformation* has since 1603, taken place in the church of England, with regard to the *habits* of its ministers. Second, That he who engages himself to obey the laws with regard to apparel, is understood to engage himself ac-

(z) Ibid. p. 72, 73. (a) Ibid. (b) Ibid. p. 48. (c) Ibid. p. 73. (d) Ibid. p. 74.

cording to prefent notions of decency and gravity, that is, in the *new and acquired*, not in the *literal* fenfe of fuch engagement: and therefore that the perfon, who does act after the *new and acquired* fenfe, fpeaks truth though contrary to the letter; whereas any one, who fhould make the engagement in the *literal* fenfe, would fpeak falfhood though according to the letter [e]."

In commenting on the Preamble to the articles, Dr. Hey obferves, "We may fay in general that the *literal* fenfe of of any form can be the right fenfe *only* while it is NEW;" and and refers us to the place where he has obferved that our "Articles" were "made 230 years ago," and treated "of the effects of age in articles of religion;" and adds, "in whatever degree they (the articles) grow *obfolete*, the Injunction muft grow fo, notwithftanding it commands interpretation in the literal fenfe [f]."

From thefe, and fimilar confiderations, viewed in connection with his own comments, it will, perhaps, appear to many, much the fame as if Dr. Hey had faid *expreffly*, that the Articles are not now generally underftood according to their *literal and primitive fignification*, but in a *new and acquired fenfe*. But however this be, it is undeniably his object to eftablifh a liberty for fuch an interpretation; and this in fome refpects, is even more contrary to the propofition of our opponents, that they teach thefe doctrines "as they were firft delivered by our Reformers [g]." While the Rule of duty is preferved entire, many degrees of deviation from it are compatible with hopes of a return, but who will adhere to its original ftrictnefs after the ftandard of conduct is depreffed? after they have a free licence to depart from it?—And what is all this but faying, in effect, We do not even *pretend* to follow the interpretation of the Reformers; we do not acknowledge ourfelves at all bound by *their fentiments*; we have a *new fenfe of our own*; the opinions of

(e) Ibid. p. 75. (f) Ibid. p. 68. (g) See above p. 13, and 17.

"thoſe we account learned and judicious men" of the *preſent day*, is our ſtandard?

A *third claſs* of Subſcribers may be mentioned, who wholly diſapprove of this UNLIMITED LATITUDE of interpretation; but who nevertheleſs plead for liberty upon, what they call, the "myſterious and difficult doctrines;" talk of *retrenchment* and *alteration*, and by other means diſcover, that there are *ſome things* in the Articles to which they do not cordially ſubſcribe.

It is ſuperfluous to obſerve that the Divines already noticed are unanimous in thus far expreſſing their diſſatisfaction with the Eſtabliſhed Creed. The obſervation ſhall however be ſupported by a ſingle paſſage from Dr. Balguy. "The Articles, we will ſay," this churchman obſerves, "are not exactly what we might wiſh them to be. Some of them are expreſſed in *doubtful* terms: others are *inaccurate*, perhaps *unphiloſophical*: others again may chance to *miſlead* an ignorant reader into ſome *erroneous* opinion [h]." He is perſuaded, however, that "there is not any one among them that leads to *immorality* [i]."—But to proceed to evidence which includes thoſe who are reputedly more orthodox.

Dr. Hey, treating on the Athanaſian Creed, ſays, that "ſeveral eminent men in our own church, have ſeemed to wiſh it removed [k]." A learned Biſhop, the Dr. alſo informs us, who "would now be a leading man in any councils in which he would think proper to engage, ſeems inclined to *retrench Articles* about *myſterious or difficult doctrines* [l]."

The Profeſſor's evidence may not, however, appear, to ſome perſons, wholly unſuſpicious. We will next therefore adduce that of the learned, and reputedly more orthodox, Dr. Ridley. Speaking of thoſe celebrated champions of our Church, and Expoſitors of her Articles, 'the Doctors Nicholls, Bennet, Waterland, Stebbing, and others,' "It doth not appear," Dr. R. ſays to his opponent, "either

(h) Ch. 6. p. 293. (i) Ibid. (k) Vol. 3. p. 114. (l) Ibid. Vol. II. p. 203.

that they did not allow the expediency of a Reformation of the Articles, or that they would have oppoſed it. I have already had occaſion to ſhow the contrary, with reſpect to Dr. Stebbing. And the Author of the Hiſtorical Eſſay on the Articles hath ſhown it of Bennet. And probably every one of thoſe you have mentioned, (the above Doctors and ſeveral others) would have owned, that ſome of the Articles now are *unneceſſary*, and others *unhappily expreſſed*. To *what alterations* they would have conſented, or their ſucceſſors would *conſent now*, you have no title to aſk, till, &c.[m]" Again, "The conceſſion, that a REFORMATION is expedient and deſirable," he ſays, "we have freely made you[n]."

But the divine who ſeems in the higheſt repute with the Gentlemen in queſtion, is the great Biſhop Warburton. His "Doctrine of Grace" is, at once, a kind of general magazine from whence almoſt every puny aſſailant of our ſyſtem borrows his weapons, and a ſuppoſed bulwark under which he ſhelters himſelf. To the works of this Prelate we are referred for correction and inſtruction in othodoxy, by Mr. Ludlam[o], Mr. Polwhele[p], Mr. Clapham[q], Dr. Croft[r], and nearly the whole hoſt of our Antagoniſts. *His* ſentiments therefore may properly be conſidered as peculiarly deſerving of attention. And they are briefly theſe; that it is owing to the *multiplicity*, the *abſtruſeneſs*, and *general fault of our Articles*, that there are ſo many unhappy diviſions among us; and that in order to remedy this evil, a great many of theſe Articles SHOULD BE RETRENCHED, and the reſt *ſimplified* and *reformed*.—Thus in a ſermon on "church communion," ſpeaking immediately of our own affairs, and "explaining how the unity of the ſpirit became violated,"—"Some men," he ſays, "... inſtead of ſtopping at the few general and fundamental principles of Chriſtian faith, clearly delivered, and uniformly believed by all, went on, and

(m) 3d Letter to the Author of the Confeſſional, p. 108.

(n) Ibid. p. 109. (o) 4 Eſſays, p. 68, 82. (p) 2d Letter to Dr. Hawker, title-page. (q) Sermon at Boroughbridge, p. 10, 25. (r) Thoughts, &c. p. 13. Note.

brought into the church, as terms of communion, *abſtruſe queſtions* relating to *points obſcurely delivered*; &c. [s]." "But ſince," he proceeds, "through a neglect of theſe rules, this unity of the Spirit hath been unhappily violated, the next queſtion is of *reſtoring* it. Which, what is here ſaid concerning the means of its preſervation, ſhows us is to be done,

By RETRENCHING all *unneceſſary* articles, to which the *animoſity of parties*, the *ſuperſtition of barbarous ages*, and even the *negligence of time*, have given an *imaginary importance*: and by *reducing the formula of faith* to the primitive ſimplicity: Leaving ALL DISPUTABLE POINTS, together with ſuch other as no party deems *neceſſary*, to the *free deciſion of every man's private judgment* [t]."

Dr. Croft ſays, "That the articles concerning Grace, Faith, and Good Works, lean towards the ſide of *enthuſiaſm* [w], and thinks our ſuperiors might explain the nature of *juſtification by faith*; and diſſuade Chriſtians from entering into the nature of predeſtination and election; it being *now*," he adds, "clearly proved both by Dr. Tucker and Dr. Paley that theſe terms regard more an admiſſion to the privileges of the goſpel, than any determinate notion of the future deſtination of Chriſtians [x]."

But it is wholly unneceſſary thus to multiply particular evidence on the point. It is eſtabliſhed by the moſt conſpicuous marks of violence and diſtortion which certain of theſe poor Articles almoſt conſtantly exhibit, and by all the labour and ingenuity which have been diſplayed to ſhow, that it is only to their GENERAL MEANING, and to ANY grammatical ſenſe of which the words are capable, to which ſubſcription is required. To *evade*, or to *extenuate*, ſome of the viſible doctrines of the articles is the end of the whole buſineſs; and we challenge our opponents to produce a ſingle Commentator, ſtrictly of their deſcription, who does

(s) Sermons at Lincoln's Inn, Vol. II. p. 177. (t) Ibid. p. 178, 179. (w) Bampton Lect. p. 110. (x) Strictures on Paley and Giſborne, p. 63, 61.

not upon ſeveral of theſe articles, endeavour to eſtabliſh a meaning *below* that of the plain, natural, and obvious ſignification of the words.

On *whatever* grounds then theſe various modes of treating the eſtabliſhed confeſſions are built; ſuch a procedure certainly does not reſemble the conduct of thoſe who adhere to the *expreſs and obvious doctrines* of theſe formularies. Will *they* pretend to believe and teach the doctrines contained in the articles, who do not conſider them as *propoſitions to be believed*, but articles only not to be publicly contradicted; *mere proſcriptions* of Papiſts, Anabaptiſts, and Puritans? Can *they* be ſuppoſed to preach according to the *primitive* ſignification of theſe articles, who tell us expreſsly that they have a *new and acquired ſenſe*, in which they may be honeſtly ſubſcribed? Is it credible that *they* ſhould "teach them as they were *firſt delivered by our Reformers*," who lament, that in conſequence of the errors of thoſe times, the articles contain ſo many things which are *objectionable*, and which want reforming? Theſe are all methods of viewing and repreſenting the ſubject which they find no ſort of occaſion for, who *really adhere to the plain and natural meaning* of the articles, as they are illuſtrated by the known ſentiments and other writings of the Reformers.

3. But let us attend a little more particularly to the CONCESSIONS of theſe Gentlemen. "A refutation," the Britiſh Critic ſays, "drawn from the admiſſions of the author himſelf, is a refutation drawn from the moſt ſatisfactory of all ſources [y]." We will begin then with the admiſſions of this Critic himſelf, in favour of our argument. "If," ſaith he, "a defection from the church is widely extended, and a *ſurrender of its orthodox principles called for*, even *by its own ſons*, we ſpeak from knowledge when we ſay, Hoc Ithacus velit, et magno mercentur Atridæ [z]." To the ſame effect, but more diſtinctly, and at large, he ſpeaks in another paſſage which we have quoted below [q].

(y) October, 1797. p. 380. (z) Jan. 1796. p. 71. (q) Ch. 9. § 1.

Dr. Hey "ſuſpects, that many of thoſe who are ſo impatient about the Athanaſian Creed, *ſecretly favour a change* in the doctrines of the church [b]." "It is not," he ſays in another place, "a thing to be neglected, that many are deſirous, at this time, to make a CHANGE in the doctrine of the National Church: *ſome* of theſe are philoſophers and ſcholars; ſome even *Miniſters of the Church* [c]." "The Engliſh Divines," he alſo obſerves, "have been ſuppoſed to favour the tenets of the *Semipelagians*, though the Liturgy of our church implies, in ſeveral places, that we hold the doctrine of *preventing grace* [d];" and though, it may be added, the articles were intended againſt Semipelagians [e]. Yet the Dr. thinks "they ſeem likely to continue and be *popular*."—He clearly admits too, adopting the ſentiments, and nearly the words, of Biſhop Warburton, that ſince the Reſtoration Divines have gotten into the *extreme* which is oppoſite to the doctrine of Juſtification by faith. Having mentioned the "great ſtreſs laid on" this doctrine previous to that event, . . "Men did not," he ſays, "fairly get into the *oppoſite extreme* until the beginning of the 18th Century. The ſtiff zeal of the ſectaries was firſt ſoftened by thoſe eminent men, who were called *Latitudinarian* Divines. . . . Ere long, Faith came to be refined away into nothing: nay, at length, an attempt was made, by a Clergyman, an eminent orthodox Divine, to prove the perfect coincidence between *Chriſtianity* and *Reaſon*, by ſhowing, that our religion was only a *republication* of the law of nature [f]."—"At length," Biſhop W. ſays, "the great GOSPEL-PRINCIPLES OF FAITH; . . . on which PROTESTANTISM was founded; . . . came to be held by many for FANATICAL."—"*Morality* was advanced ſo high, and *Faith* ſo frittered into nonſenſe, that a new Definition of our religion, (namely, that it was only this *republication* of the law of nature,) in oppoſition to its Founders, and unknown to its early Followers, was

(b) Vol. III. p. 116. (c) Ibid. Vol. II. p. 199. (d) Ibid. Vol. III. p. 203. (e) See Nor. Lect. Vol. II. p. 209. Note (f) Ibid. Vol. III. p. 265, and "Divine Legation," B. 3.

grown to be the *faſhionable tenet* of the times[z]." *This*, he ſays again, was "a Principle become *faſhionably orthodox*[y]."

Nor will they ſuffer us to ſuppoſe, that theſe ſlighted doctrines of Proteſtantiſm, have ever been reinſtated in their ancient credit, *ſince* this period.—According to Biſhop W., efforts toward this end were making, "when the old Puritan Fanaticiſm revived, under the new name of *Methodiſm*. . . . This," he adds, "ſoon put a *ſtop to the recovery* of that middle way, in which *Grace* and *Morality* are preſerved in their reſpective rights: an unhappy diſpoſition now appearing in ſeveral oppoſers of this late revived fanaticiſm, to return back to the old *latitudinarian* exceſſes[x]"

"Such improvements," continues Biſhop Shipley, "have been made by the clergy, in the *rational* manner of preaching, that in ſome inſtances they have even reformed the doctrines of the church itſelf." ... "At preſent," his Lordſhip adds, "it appears that OUR ABLEST DIVINES have gradually departed from ſome rigorous interpretations of the articles that prevailed at firſt: this is not unknown to thoſe who alone have authority to determine what is moſt expedient for us; and we doubt not, but in their own good time, they will conſent to have the *burdens* that are complained of removed[s]."

According, indeed, to the notions of this Prelate, Archdeacon Paley, Dr. Hey, &c. reſpecting "the effects of age in articles of religion," and their ſuppoſition that a church is, in reality, conſtantly *changing* its creed, *this difference* between the *actual* and *profeſſed* ſentiments of our Divines *muſt* obtain under the preſent circumſtances of our church. A paſſage from the Archdeacon ſhall confirm what has already been advanced to this effect. After mentioning the inconveniences attending "eſtabliſhed creeds and confeſſions" before noticed, "However," he adds, "they may expreſs the perſuaſion, or be accommodated to the controverſies, or to the fears, of *the age in which they are compoſed*, in proceſs of

(z) Doct. of Grace, p. 316—319. (y) Ibid. p. 325.
(x) Ibid. p. 326. (s) Charge 2. p. 43.

time, and by reaſon of the changes which are wont to take place in the judgment of mankind upon religious ſubjects, they come at length to *contradict the actual opinions* of the church whoſe doctrines they profeſs to contain[h]." That the doctrines of our church therefore ſhould be believed and taught *now* as they were taught near 240 *years* ago, is a thing ſcarcely poſſible!!!

The conceſſions of Dr. Croft alſo deſerve further attention. Having propoſed the queſtion, "Whether, upon the ſuppoſition that the reformation had been deferred till our days, the articles would not have been *materially different* from the preſent? No advantage," he anſwers, "is given by allowing that they *certainly would;*" and then proceeds to ſhow how *proper and neceſſary* this would be. Speaking of the doctrines of the articles, and the opinions which obtained when they were firſt impoſed, "Oppoſite errors in our time," he ſays, "require a DIFFERENT KIND of religious inſtruction[i]." Now what is this but the very reverſe of the doctrine of his pamphlet? That, in ſuch a caſe, ſome *verbal* and *trivial* difference would obtain, may readily be admitted without affecting the queſtion. But with whatever propriety it would be done, for that is not here our ſubject, they who would now make the articles MATERIALLY DIFFERENT, and who maintain that a *different kind of religious inſtruction is now proper*, muſt believe and teach ſomething *materially different* from theſe articles, which is ſurely the very contrary to *adhering* to them and teaching them as they were *firſt delivered by our reformers*.

But that, in Dr. C's judgment, this difference would not conſiſt in any thing trivial or unimportant, but in the fundamental and moſt diſtinguiſhing doctrines of the goſpel, in the articles which reſpect grace, faith, and good-works, he has fully informed us. That theſe articles "lean towards the ſide of enthuſiaſm," he ſeems not to doubt but every body muſt admit; and it "is neither" he ſays, "to

(h) Moral and Polit. p. 568. 4to. (i) Bampt. Lect. p. 110.

be condemned nor wondered at[k]." We may be pardoned for repeating the paſſage becauſe the doctor has honoured it with a place in two ſeparate publications[l], which ſhows that it is expreſſive of his deliberate judgment, and of a ſentiment he is zealous to propagate.

But ſurely this is leaning towards the repreſentation Mr. Hume has made of our eſtabliſhed creed[z]. It is however another proof that Dr. C. and thoſe of his opinion, have not ſtrictly adhered to the doctrines of this creed. It cannot be ſuppoſed that, with the whole aggregate of learning and rationality, which it ſeems they excluſively poſſeſs, they ſhould believe and teach that which only *leans* towards this degrading error. Nay, the paſſage not only proves that Dr. Croft and his aſſociates do *not* adhere to the doctrines of the articles, contrary to what his pamphlet maintains; but alſo, as far as his authority reaches, that thoſe whom he calls Methodiſts *do* adhere to them, which he denies. For, according to his ſtatement, the matter ſtands thus: The doctrines of the Methodiſts are mixed with *enthuſiaſm*: the articles of our Church lean towards *enthuſiaſm*: then, according to the moſt conſummate logician, things that are *like the ſame thing*, are *like one another*: Ergo, the *doctrines of the Methodiſts*, and the *articles of our Church* are *alike;* and Dr. Croft's differ from both! At leaſt, this *leans* towards a proof of the point. But Dr. Croft ſhall further ratify it. The author of Pietas Oxonienſis, (a profeſſed Calviniſt and Methodiſt, and abettor of Goſpel miniſters) Dr. C. ſays, "*well knew* that the *articles leaned* to his ſide of the queſtion; in this he, and all the fraternity triumphed[m]."

But who would expect any thing in ſupport of our poſition from our very warm opponents, the Antijacobin Reviewers? Yet even they have heard of "the ratiocination of the cold Theologian." And mark their words. "We cannot," they

(k) Ibid.
(l) Ibid. and Strict. on Paley, &c. p. 58.
(z) See below, Ch. 8. § 2.
(m) Strictures on Paley, &c. p. 63.

ſay, "but lament, that learning too often operates on the minds of our grave Dignitaries, with an influence fatal to common ſenſe and nature. We have had occaſion to peruſe more than one Infirmary ſermon, for inſtance, from the *Clarendon preſs at Oxford*, a dry, unanimated, philoſophical lecture; MORE IN THE MANNER OF ARISTOTLE THAN OF CHRIST [n]."—Another paſſage, not a little to our purpoſe, they have produced us, from their deſervedly admired author, Mr. Jones; and from a work upon which they beſtow the very higheſt encomiums. "We have allowed," ſays 'this excellent advocate for ſound principles in religion and politics,' as they characterize him, "ſo much to human philoſophy, that it is *too commonly known* againſt our preachers, and factiouſly objected to them, that they NEGLECT THE GOSPEL, and take what they call *good natural religion* into the pulpit.—This is JUSTLY thought to be a GREAT AND CRYING ABUSE; in conſequeuce of which *Goſpel-preachers* ariſe and abound, who have no authority to teach the people [o]."—And "the root of" this, he adds, is, that "our preachers are formed and educated" after ſuch "directions as Biſhop Warburton's [p]."

Surely then, all theſe Gentlemen forget themſelves, when they ſo indignantly "reprobate" and "ſpurn [q]" the mention of this circumſtance by others. If there is *not* a foundation for the charge, why are they thus guilty of *ſlandering* their brethren? Why, in all theſe ways, do they contribute towards the ſupport and propagation of ſuch an idea? If there is a foundation for it, and if this conduct is, as they here ſay, "JUSTLY THOUGHT TO BE A GREAT AND CRYING ABUSE, why do they on other occaſions ſo vehemently deny it? And why may not *others* who view the matter in this light

(n) Nov. 1799. p. 306. (o) Ibid. Nov. 1798. p. 528. (p) Ibid.

(q) See Croft's Strictures on Paley, &c. p. 145; Clapham's Ser. at Boroughbridge, p. 28; Daubeny's Appendix, p. 622; &c.

openly lament it as well as themſelves? What conſtitutes that conduct weakneſs, and enthuſiaſm, and reviling in *ſome* miniſters in the church, which is not ſuch in others? And if, in reality, they do not perceive a *nearer* reſemblance between our doctrines and thoſe of the *church*, why do they thus characterize them by the *ſame epithet?* And why do they *ſay* "that the articles lean to our ſide of the queſtion?

Nor can our concluſion be evaded by ſaying, that *their* obſervations are confined within much narrower limits. Some of our writers, doubtleſs, may have expreſsed themſelves in *too general terms*. It was natural for men under their circumſtances, and experiencing their treatment, to do ſo. The perſons, however, cenſured in the paſsages juſt quoted, are "The Clergy,"—"Our ableſt Divines,"—Our Preachers,"—the Engliſh Divines[r]," &c. expreſsions which extend the conduct in queſtion far beyond what this work undertakes.

4. But, as the oppoſers of our doctrines would be thought to have great reſpect for the judgment of our *Biſhops*, and wiſh to charge us with a dereliction of our duty towards theſe dignitaries of the church[s], ——Let us hear the OPINION of ſome of our moſt active and eminent PRELATES on the ſubject we are diſcuſsing.

Few men, it may be preſumed, have worn the Mitre with more luſtre than Archbiſhop Secker. And there is, perhaps, no writer whoſe works are more generally recommended to the peruſal of the clergy, by the preſent Biſhops, and other Dignitaries of our church[t]. His opinion therefore cannot but highly deſerve our attention. One paſsage deciſively expreſſive of this opinion has already been produced[o]. We will here add another. Treating then directly on our ſubject, he addreſses the clergy thus:—"To improve the people effectually, . . you muſt be aſſiduous in teaching the principles

(r) Above p. 30, 31, 34. (s) See Antijac. Rev. April 1799. p. 364. (t) See the charge of the Biſhop of London, 1791; liſt of Books recommended by the Biſhop of Cheſter; &c. (o) Title page.

not only of virtue and natural religion, but of THE GOSPEL; and of the gospel, not as ALMOST EXPLAINED AWAY by modern refiners, but 'as the truth is in Jesus;' as it is taught by the church of which you are members; as you have engaged by your subscriptions and declarations, that you will teach it yourselves.——You must preach to them faith in the ever-blessed Trinity;... you must set forth the original corruption of our nature; our redemption according to God's eternal purpose in Christ, by the sacrifice of the cross; our sanctification by the influences of the Divine Spirit; the insufficiency of good works, and the efficacy of faith to salvation....

The *truth*, I fear, is, that MANY IF NOT MOST OF US have dwelt too little on these doctrines in our sermons,... partly from not having studied Theology deeply enough to treat of them ably and beneficially: God grant it may never have been for want of inwardly experiencing their importance.—But whatever be the cause, *the effect has been lamentable.*—Our people have grown less and less mindful, first of the *distinguishing* articles of their creed, then, as will always be the case, of that one which they hold in common with the heathens;... flattering themselves, that what they are pleased to call a moral and harmless life, though far from being either, is the one thing needful.... Reflections have been made upon us... on account of these things, by Deists, Papists, Brethren of our own [v], &c."

The pious Bishop of London has thought it necessary to give a perfectly similar exhortation to his clergy; which is, in effect, acknowledging a similar occasion for it. Amidst many other excellent admonitions, "More particularly," his Lordship says, "it will not be sufficient to amuse your hearers with ingenious moral essays on the dignity of human nature, the beauty of virtue, and the deformity and inconvenience of vice. This will be a

(v) Ch. 1. p. 79, Watson's Tracts, Vol. 6,

feeble and ineffectual effort; will be as founding braſs and a tinkling cymbal. If you wiſh for any effectual ſucceſs, you muſt take a very different courſe. You muſt lay before your people, with plainneſs and with force, the great *fundamental doctrines* of the goſpel." And, having enumerated thoſe which we conſider ſuch, "Theſe," his Lordſhip proceeds, "are the great evangelical doctrines which muſt be preſſed repeatedly with devout and ſolemn earneſtneſs, on the minds of your hearers, which can alone ſpeak to their conſciences, their affections, and their hearts[w]." Thus does this venerable Prelate condemn a contrary conduct, and recommend the preciſe mode of preaching adopted by us.

The learned Biſhop of Lincoln quaſhes, at a ſtroke, all the caſuiſtry, we have ſeen employed to *evade* the plain meaning of the articles, and to *juſtify ſubſcription without actual belief*. "The Articles," he ſays, "are to be ſubſcribed in their PLAIN AND OBVIOUS SENSE, and aſſent is to be given to them *ſimply and unequivocally*." Nor *can* the contrary procedure be condemned more ſtrongly. "If," his Lordſhip proceeds, "the candidate for holy orders thinks that he ſees reaſon to *diſſent from any of the doctrines* aſſerted in them, no hope of emolument or honour; no dread of inconvenience or diſappointment ſhould induce him to expreſs his *ſolemn aſſent to propoſitions, which in fact he does not believe*. . . . And let it be ever remembered, that in a buſineſs of this ſerious and important nature, NO SPECIES WHATEVER OF EVASION, SUBTERFUGE, OR RESERVE IS TO BE ALLOWED, OR CAN BE PRACTICED, WITHOUT IMMINENT DANGER OF INCURRING THE WRATH OF GOD[x]."

That great Divine, Biſhop Horſley, has occupied nearly a

(w) Ch. 1799, p. 22, 23.

(x) Elements of Theology, Vol. ii. p. 567. How does the Britiſh Critic reconcile his unqualified praiſe of all this, with his "avowed ſatisfaction in," and high commendation of *Dr. Paley's* notions? ſee his Rev. for December, 1799, and above, p. 18.

whole Charge in ſpecifying, lamenting, reprobating, accounting for, and attempting to reform, the conduct in queſtion. The reaſon, in this Prelate's opinion, why the labours of the clergy are not more efficacious in ſtopping the progreſs of infidelity and ſectariſm, he ſays, is, "that erroneous maxims are gone abroad, which, for ſeveral years paſt, if my obſervation deceive me not, have very much *governed* the conduct of the *parochial clergy* in the *miniſtration of the word*[y]."——Theſe maxims, he tells us, are, "That it is more the office of a Chriſtian teacher, to preſs the *practice* of religion upon the conſciences of his hearers, than to inculcate and aſſert its *doctrines*." And, "That *practical religion and morality* are *one* and the *ſame thing*: That *moral duties* conſtitute the *whole*, or by far the better part, of *practical Chriſtianity* [z]."——"Both theſe maxims," his Lordſhip proceeds, "are erroneous, Both, as far as they are received, have a pernicious influence on the miniſtry of the word. The firſt, moſt abſurdly ſeparates practice from the motives of practice. The ſecond, adopting that ſeparation, reduces practical Chriſtianity to heathen virtue; and the two, taken together, have much contributed TO DIVEST OUR SERMONS OF THE GENUINE SPIRIT AND SAVOUR OF CHRISTIANITY, AND TO REDUCE THEM TO MERE MORAL ESSAYS.——The ſyſtem chiefly in requeſt, with thoſe who ſeem the moſt in earneſt in this ſtrain of preaching, is the ſtrict, but impracticable, unſocial, ſullen moral of the *Stoics*.——Thus, under the influence of theſe two pernicious maxims, it too often happens, that *we loſe ſight of that which is our proper office*, to publiſh the word of reconciliation, to propound the terms of peace and pardon to the penitent; and we make no other uſe of the high commiſſion that we bear, than to come abroad one day in the ſeven, dreſſed in ſolemn looks, and in the external garb of holineſs, *to be the* APES OF EPICTETUS[a]." This may ſerve as a ſpecimen; but, as we have ſaid, nearly the *whole Charge*

(y) Ch. 1790. p. 3. (z) Ibid. p. 4, 5. (a) Ibid. p. 5, 6.

is to the same effect.——And this opinion of the Bishop of Rochester is fully approved and confirmed,

By the late excellent Bishop Horne. Speaking of those who make too much of what they call natural religion, and of the increase of infidelity occasioned by this conduct, "And," he says, "as *the unedifying morality of our pulpits* is a growth from the same root, we need not wonder at the zeal and earnestness, with which it hath very lately been treated, by a learned and able Prelate of this church, whose *words are the words of wisdom*, and his *example worthy of imitation*.[c]" This prelate, a note informs us, is Bishop Horsley——. Again: "Of late times," says this ornament of our church, "there hath been a prejudice in favour of good *moral preaching;* as if the people might do very well, or even better, without the knowledge of the Christian mysteries; a good moral life being the end of all teaching. The enemies of Christianity, taking advantage of this prejudice, have made a total separation between the works of religion, and its doctrines; pleading the example and authority of some of our divines. And it *must not be concealed*, that, by delivering cold *inanimate lectures on moral virtue, independent of Christianity*, MANY OF OUR CLERGY *of late years* have lost themselves very much in the estimation of the religious part of the laity.[d]" We will only add, for we might proceed at pleasure,——

The opinion of the very eloquent and eminent Bishop of Durham, on the subject. Having noticed that the obligations which are upon ministers to preach the established doctrines, he says, "The DOCTRINES which you are thus bound by your *duty to God*, to the *laws of your country*, and the *engagements of your profession*, to inculcate and maintain, have been of LATE YEARS TOO MUCH NEGLECTED: as if doctrines of faith were subordinate parts of Christianity.

(c) Ch. 1792. p. 19. (d) Ibid. p. 14.

Yet, all that diſtinguiſhes Chriſtianity from other religions, is doctrinal."

His Lordſhip then proceeds, after the manner of the Prelates already noticed, to inveſtigate the cauſes of this neglect. "As doctrines of faith," he obſerves, "are ſo important a part of a Chriſtian miniſter's duty, it concerns him to guard himſelf againſt the *cauſes which have operated to their* NEGLECT. One cauſe has been, the ſuppoſed unfitneſs of ſuch ſubjects for general inſtruction, eſpecially of the poor and uneducated[f]." ... "But," after ſome other pertinent obſervations, "whatever," he adds, "*our* doubts of their capacity may be, the injunction is clear and poſitive, that to them the goſpel ſhould be preached. But what is this goſpel? ... Not mere precepts of morality. ... The good-tidings are the hopes and conſolations which are offered by the new covenant, and reſt on the ſatisfaction made for us, *not by ourſelves*, but *by our Redeemer*. To preach the goſpel, therefore, is to preach the doctrines of ſatisfaction by the death of Chriſt; that is, the doctrines of atonement and redemption: and to preach them to the poor, is to preach them to the *congregations from which they have often been ſtudiouſly excluded*[g]."——"Another cauſe," it is added, "*of the neglect of theſe doctrines* has been the improper uſe made of them by enthuſiaſts. ... The rationaliſt adopted an oppoſite doctrine to the enthuſiaſt; and *moral works* were held out as *alone neceſſary to ſalvation*. The concluſion was founded on a common fallacy, that where one extreme is wrong, the oppoſite muſt be right. Yet this is, in truth, an error, at leaſt as unſcriptural, and of as great magnitude as the other[h]."

Such was this learned Prelate's judgment in 1792, and five years of further diligent attention to the ſubject, ſeems fully to have confirmed him in the opinion. In his admired

---

(f) Ibid. p. 18. (g) Ibid. p. 19. (h) Ibid. p. 20.

charge delivered in 1797, having mentioned it as his sentiment, and "assigned his reasons for thinking, that the growth of scepticism and infidelity in the Christian world, is chiefly to be ascribed to an almost universal lukewarmness and indifference in Christians, respecting the *essentials of their religion, the peculiar grounds of their faith, of their hopes, and their fears;*" and, having observed how exceedingly it concerns the clergy to inform themselves, "whence arises this unchristian lukewarmness," he adds, "Upon the most diligent view of the subject, I am persuaded, that lukewarmness in religion is, in a great measure, to be ascribed to the following causes:" and then specifying *four, one* of them is,——An INFREQUENCY IN THE PULPIT of those subjects which constitute the PECULIAR DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY[i]."——On this cause, therefore, his Lordship continues particularly to expatiate, and urges upon his clergy the removal of it, with the utmost force of pious eloquence and zeal.

And is there after all *no ground* for this complaint? Do not these distinguished Heads and Champions of the church, after "the most diligent view," *understand* the subject? Or are *they* guilty of "gross misrepresentation?" Is *this* "the raving of enthusiasm?" Or will the British Critic and Mr. Daubeny call *this* "the reviling of sectaries[k]?" Men may indeed *say* what they please, and when they please *contradict* at one time what they *affirm* at another. Thus however does it appear,

That one class of these Divines in *vindicating* such a conduct,—another in *confessing* it, and our Bishops in *lamenting* it, conspire to *establish the fact*, in opposition to our Assailants, that *many* of them have not adhered to the *obvious doctrines of the articles;* or in other words, do not *preach so evangelically* as these forms:———And thus, on the other hand,

---

(i) Page 21. (k) Brit. Crit. September, 1797, p. 302; Guide to the Church, p. 324; 378.

do *we profeſs* to adhere to their *plain meaning;* thus is it *confeſſed* that the articles lean to our ſide of the queſtion; and thus do theſe eminent Prelates recommend, with all their energy, the very ſtyle of preaching by which *we are characterized*, for which we are *calumniated*, and *which only* we would here vindicate.

The importance of our ſubject, however, it is preſumed, may juſtify its more full diſcuſſion. Let the reader then only exerciſe a little patience, and he ſhall be fully ſatisfied on the queſtion.

CHAP. II.

The REAL SENSE OF THE ARTICLES, AND DOCTRINES OF OUR REFORMERS *inveſtigated, and appealed to, on the queſtion.*

SECTION I.

The true interpretation ſought from, our different forms as they illuſtrate and explain each other; the title, and preamble, annexed to the articles; the circumſtances and object of our reformers; their other public and approved writings; and the authorities they reſpected.

MUCH, it has appeared, is done to ſhow, that the articles are not to be interpreted according to their *literal* and *obvious* meaning; but that *leſs* is often *intended* in them than ſeems to be *expreſſed*. The moſt orthodox of our opponents contend for this extenuating conſtruction of *ſome* of the articles. Is there then really *any ground* for it? "The meaning of the Articles," the Antijacobin Reviewers have allowed, "*is undoubtedly to be ſought* from the framers of them[a]." Is there then, in reality, *any evidence, or any preſumption, that the framers of our Articles did not mean to be underſtood according to the natural, obvious, and full ſignification of their words?*

Men's *words* are the uſual channel through which they diſcover what they wiſh to be known of their *intentions*. And no men, it is preſumed, have afforded greater proof of their abhorrence of every ſpecies of duplicity and prevarication, than the original framers[b] of our articles did: no occaſion could be more adapted to call forth their integrity into its full exerciſe: no ſet of men ever uſed greater deliberation, or diſcovered great ſerioufneſs in any undertaking[c].

(a) January 1800. p. 19. (b) The Martyrs Cranmer, Ridley, &c. (c) See Burnet's Hiſt. of Reformat. Vol. ii. p. 93, 155, 405. Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 273.

Beſides, we have here their public profeſſions and declarations on theſe ſubjects, upon different occaſions, under different circumſtances, and in a variety of forms. The articles, homilies, and liturgy of our church, are three diſtinct ſpecies of writings. They were compoſed at different times, and, in ſome reſpects, for different purpoſes. And yet, in point of doctrine, they uniformly breathe the ſame ſpirit, and expreſs themſelves with the ſame degree of force. No one of them contracts the ideas, or by any means leſſens the import of the reſt; but, when compared with honeſty, and underſtood according to the common rules of interpreting written compoſitions, each mutually illuſtrates and confirms the full, and natural ſenſe, of the others. In this light they were uniformly conſidered by the great characters who reviewed, and examined them, at their firſt eſtabliſhment[d]; and whatever may have been urged to the contrary from a few *detached paſſages*, he muſt be a very ſuperficial Theologian, who conſiders them *thoroughly*, and does not perceive the ſame *exact harmony* in them now. To the great diſturbance of ſuch Divines as Archdeacon Paley, the doctrines of the articles are "woven with much induſtry into her forms of public worſhip[e]."——This circumſtance therefore muſt materially aſſiſt us in diſcovering the original ſenſe and intention of the *whole*, and leaves little room to doubt but it was that which is moſt obviouſly ſuggeſted by the *words*, when underſtood according to the common uſe of language applied to ſuch ſubjects.

If however a doubt could remain of the *Deſign* of ſuch words, ſo repeated, and under ſuch circumſtances, even *that* would be removed by the *Title* which the Articles bear. "To form an additional barrier," as the Antijacobin Reviewers well expreſs themſelves, "to fix expreſsly what was ſufficiently fixed already by its own quality, to ſhut the door for ever againſt ſuch ſophiſtry," as that of Dr. Paley

(d) See Strype's Eccles. Memorials p. 32, 84, 85, 210; Act of Uniformity; &c. (e) Above, p. 17.

and his approvers, "the very articles themſelves are averred by the very convocation which framed them, to be framed 'for AVOIDING DIVERSITIES OF OPINIONS, and the eſtabliſhing of *conſent* touching true religion'." (f)

Now ſurely the authors of theſe forms of doctrine muſt have beſt known their own meaning and intention in them. And while *they* have ſo unequivocally declared that *this* was their object, it muſt be an extraordinary mode of reaſoning that can *now* prove the contrary. But how could this end be obtained, or even hoped for, if they did not as clearly as poſſible diſcover their *Intention* by their *Words?* In what other manner was it to be collected? How otherwiſe was this uniformity of doctrine to be eſtabliſhed, and propagated through the nation? It does not indeed, by any means, appear from hence, as ſome have perverſely argued (g), that their ideas of conſent extended to *every ſubject*, and *every opinion*, that can poſſibly enter the Theologian's mind. They had, no doubt, immediately in view the great ſubjects then in controverſy, and upon which they *profeſſedly* treated in theſe Articles, and on each ſubject the *extent* to which they have *expreſsly* decided. But ſo much they muſt have intended by the phraſe: This their avowed object rendered neceſſary; and this is that for which we contend.

But our argument receives a ſtill further confirmation from the Royal DECLARATION which is prefixed to the articles. This, which, like preambles in general, was made for the expreſs purpoſe of teaching us the right method of interpretation, has determined the matter in the fulleſt manner in which words can poſſibly determine any thing. It ſpeaks of the *literal meaning* of the ſaid articles, as "the true and uſual" meaning. It prohibits us from "*varying or departing* from them in the *leaſt degree*," or from "affixing any NEW SENSE to any article.———And what is not a

(f) Jan. 1800. p. 19. (g) The Confeſſional, Friend in his Letters to Biſhop Pretyman, and others who wiſh to diſparage ſubſcription to human forms.

little remarkable, in regard to that article, with which Divines *now* take the *greateſt liberties*, and which they *moſt labour to evade, extenuate, and annihilate*, this preamble is the *moſt expreſs in prohibitng ſuch a procedure*. The injunction in reſpect to this is, "That no man ſhall either *print or preach* to *draw the article*[z] *aſide any way*, but ſhall ſubmit to it in the *plain* and FULL MEANING THEREOF; and ſhall not put his OWN SENSE or comment to be the *meaning of the article*, but ſhall take it in the LITERAL AND GRAMMATICAL SENSE[h]."——If therefore common language is any longer to be made the vehicle of common ſenſe, whatever is the *plain*, *literal*, *grammatical*, and *full ſenſe* of the *words* of the articles, *that* is the ſenſe in which they are to be underſtood.

This declaration, it is true, was not provided either at the time when theſe articles were firſt compiled, or impoſed, and is therefore only evidence of their intention *then*, as it teaches that this literal and grammatical ſenſe, was "always" the "true and uſual" ſenſe of them. But, admitting its validity, which is generally done by our Divines[i], this circumſtance of its poſteriority, renders it of *more* importance as a directory to us. It ſhows, what well deſerves our attention, that it was not, as ſome would inſinuate, only on the *firſt moment* of her emerging from Popery, that our church adopted this mode of interpretation; but that more than half a century afterwards[k] ſhe adhered to it; or to ſpeak more correctly, did not deſcend *below* it.

And as to any interpretation leſs favourable to our ſcheme, being inferred from the ſuppoſed *Deſign* of this Inſtrument; whoever impartially conſiders the real occaſion and circumſtances of it will, ſurely, find, that they af-

---

(z) The 17th, no doubt, is meant.

(h) See the preamble to Arts. (i) Biſhop Burnet's Expo. of Arts. Intro. p. 8; Dr. Bennet's Eſſay on 39 Arts. p. 423; Dr Ridley's 2nd Letter. p. 143, &c. and Poſtſcript; &c. (k) See ibid.

ford much ſtronger reaſons for the very oppoſite concluſion. If we will ſuffer it to explain its own deſign, it accords preciſely with its expreſſions. It ties Divines to this ſtrict adherence to the Articles, from a conviction, that, thus explained, they "contain the true doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God's word;" and in order, to terminate the "unhappy differences[l]" conſequent upon a departure from this rule of interpretation.

But what is the hiſtory of this Injunction? Biſhop Laud, in favour at Court, and a few of his Aſſociates, had adopted, what are ſometimes called, milder notions, on the points peculiar to Calviniſm, than thoſe which, according to the united teſtimony of all parties[m], generally prevailed in the nation, at that period. On this account, Biſhop Burnet informs us, they were accuſed of "departing from the true ſenſe of the Articles. But it was anſwered by them, that ſince they took the Articles in their literal and grammatical ſenſe, they did not prevaricate. And to ſupport this," adds his Lordſhip, "that declaration was ſet forth[n]." In this view therefore, and as it is expreſſive of the doctrines *then* taught in the church, it proves our point *a fortiori*; inaſmuch as, of the two parties into which the church was divided, that which was the moſt moderate profeſſed to reach this ſtandard, while the other, which conſiſted of a great majority, was ſuppoſed to exceed it. And that an inſtrument thus circumſtanced, ſo poſitively and expreſsly inculcating the direct contrary, ſhould have ever been conſtrued into a general licence to deviate from the plain and full meaning of theſe articles, is, ſurely, an almoſt unexampled inſtance of the perverſion of common ſenſe, and common language, and of the triumph of cafuiſtry over conſcience.

2. All this then appears upon the very face of the Prayer-book; and only additional ſupport of our Doctrine will be

(l) See the Preamble. (m) See below, §. 2. (n) See Remarks on the Examina. of his Expo. of the 2nd Art. of our Ch. p. 3.

discovered, from a more extensive view of the OBJECT and SITUATION of the authors of our established forms. The circumstance usually alledged in support of a contrary opinion, is,—That *the errors of the church of Rome being founded on the side of human powers and merit, our Reformers, to correct these errors, expressed themselves too strongly on the opposite side of the question;* or, to borrow Dr. Croft's simile, That to make the crooked straight, they bent it the other way[o]. This circumstance the Doctor assigns as the reason, why "the articles concerning grace, faith, and good works, lean towards the side of enthusiasm," and why such a leaning "is neither to be condemned nor wondered at[p]."

But is it not in itself a thing equally probable, that they would make every possible concession towards those from whom they separated, and whom they were anxious to conciliate into an approbation of their principles? And, when the characters of our Reformers and the other circumstances of their situation are considered, is not there a strong presumption that this would be their conduct? Their good sense and knowledge of mankind would suggest to them, that on no other plan they could so reasonably expect the accomplishment of their designs. The temper of Cranmer who at its origin, and during so considerable a part of its progress, was at once the main-spring, and chief Director in the business, and who had so principal a hand in the actual composition of our articles, would incline him to such a procedure[q]. And afterwards, when these articles were finally adjusted, and established by law, it was the known disposition, and express direction of Queen Elizabeth and her Council, that nothing should be insisted upon unnecessarily, but that every suitable *concession* should be

(o) Bamp. Lect. p, 110; Gray's Bamp. Lect. p. 265; Hey's Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 497. (p) Bamp. Lect. p. 110.

(q) Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 272. and passim.

made toward the ancient syſtem. The nature of their ſituation would indeed make ſuch a procedure appear even neceſſary, in order to the ſmalleſt proſpect of ſucceſs. And ſuch we are aſſured it was in fact. "It was the principle of Cranmer," Biſhop Pretyman obſerves, "to proceed with moderation, not to reject too much of what people had been accuſtomed to, to procure a *gradual change* in their opinions [q];" and, "Elizabeth's apparent attachment to uſages that had obtained under the ancient eſtabliſhment," his Lordſhip adds, cauſed "ſeveral alterations to be made with a view to conciliate the Roman Catholics [r]."—Biſhop Burnet had before taught, that the avowed Rule by which the Agents in this buſineſs proceeded was, to make *no innovation without the moſt ſubſtantial reaſon for it;* but, in imitation of Chriſt and his Apoſtles at the firſt eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity, *to accommodate their ſyſtem to the prevailing opinions and prejudices*, as far as was compatible with what they deemed eſſential to be received [s]. And, that in many reſpects they unqueſtionably adhered to this rule, we have an irrefragable proof in the clamours of their contemporaries the Puritans, and of Diſſenters ever ſince, for a further reformation [t]. Theſe clamours, at the firſt, indeed, related rather to other matters than to *doctrines;* but it would be unaccountably ſtrange to ſuppoſe that they acted upon directly oppoſite principles with reſpect to doctrine, from thoſe by which they were governed in external matters.

Admitting, however, for the ſake of argument, that if to have ſecured the Church againſt the errors of Rome had been the *only* object of our Reformers in the Articles, it were poſſible, they would have acted as the objection ſup-

---

(q) Elements, &c. Vol. ii. p. 22. (r) Ibid. p. 25.
(s) Hiſt. of Refor. Vol. ii. p. 73. See alſo Hume's Hiſt. v. 5. p. 149.
(t) See Neal's Hiſt. of the Puritans, Vol. i. p. 180, 235, and paſſim; Mr. Wellbeloved's Sermon, entitled, "The principles of Roman Catholics and Unitarians compared;" &c.

poſes, and have verged in their language toward the oppoſite extreme. Was this really the caſe?—If we may credit the Biſhops, Burnet[v], Conybeare[w], and Pretyman[x]; the Doctors, Heylin[y], Ridley[z], Tucker[a], Hey[b], and Croft[c]; the Hiſtorian Mr. Hume[d]; or in ſhort, the collective evidence of nearly all modern writers, on the ſubject, it was *equally* the object of the framers of our national Creed to guard againſt the extravagancies of thoſe who proceeded to THIS EXTREME, and to free themſelves from the calumnies theſe extravagancies had occaſioned. "It was the endeavour of Elizabeth," ſays Hume, "to guide her people by God's rule, in the JUST MEAN between the corruptions of Rome and the errors of modern Sectaries[e]." And to the ſame purport ſpeak the reſt, with reſpect to the founders of our Eſtabliſhment in general. His Lordſhip of Sarum mentions the prevalence of this latter evil, as ONE of TWO ESPECIAL circumſtances, which rendered an eſtabliſhed form of doctrine neceſſary[f]. To provide againſt it was therefore a full *half* of the intention of our articles. Heylin would almoſt inſinuate, that, when theſe articles were finally reviſed and impoſed, under Elizabeth, to guard againſt this extreme was their PRINCIPAL OBJECT[g]. And, that this ſuppoſed error really conſiſted in laying too great ſtreſs upon the doctrines of divine grace, as oppoſed to the powers and merit of man, theſe writers would leave us no room to doubt. Beſides their expreſs aſſertions, and general reaſonings, the very epithets applied to thoſe accuſed of

(v) Hiſt. of Refor. Vol. ii. p. 27, and 113. and Expo. of Arts. p. 4. (w) Ser. on Sub. in the Oxford Enchieridion, &c. p. 242. (x) Elements &c. Vol. ii. p. 36. (y) Quinq. Hiſt. p. 589, 597, of his Tracts. (z) 2 Lett. to Conf. p. 24, 29, 141, 168. (a) Letters to Dr. Kippis. (b) Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 330. (c) Bamp. Lect. p. 109—112. (d) Hiſt. of England, Vol. v. Ch. 40. p. 149. (e) Ibid. (f) Expo. of Arts. p. 4. (g) Quinq. Hiſt. p. 589, 597.

it, eſtabliſh the point. They are denominated, among other diſtinctions, "mad enthuſiaſts;" "corrupt goſpellers;" "men who thought that if they magnified Chriſt, and depended upon his merits, they might diſregard morality;" "thoſe who thought themſelves more evangelical than others;" and who "buſily ſtickled in the maintenance of Calvin's doctrine [h]." The "12th Article," the Biſhop of Lincoln ſays, "was added in 1562, in oppoſition to the opinions of certain ſects called Antinomians, Solifidians, and Goſpellers, who denied the neceſſity of good works [i]." "Our Church," Dr. Hey proceeds, "did not . . . properly intend to lay down any doctrine of predeſtination; but only to *declare againſt abuſes actually prevailing* [j];" or as Mr. Daubeny explains the matter, only to "give a ſeries of texts relative to a certain myſterious ſubject, *chiefly for the purpoſe of guarding againſt the abuſe of them* [r]." In this caſe, therefore, the authors of our forms of doctrine would neceſſarily uſe the very utmoſt caution in the expreſſion of their ſentiments. They would, as far as the language of their times, and the ſubjects in hand rendered it poſſible, expreſs juſt what they intended to be received, and no more. They could not expreſs themſelves too ſtrongly againſt the old errors, but they encouraged the new ones. They were placed between Scylla and Charybdis, and could not ſteer at too great a diſtance from the one, without equal danger of ſplitting upon the other. And thus have theſe Gentlemen, by their own ſtatement, ſet their bending objection ſtraight, and proved, notwithſtanding its general prevalence, and apparent plauſibility, that it has no foundation whatever.

There are perſons however, who, notwithſtanding all this, believe it a fact, that as far as *doctrine* was concerned, theſe very extravagancies, not leſs than the corruptions of

---

(h) Ibid.; Hiſtory of Refor. Vol. ii. p. 27; &c. (i) Elements, Vol. ii. p. 265. (j) Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 502.
(r) Appendix, &c. p. 219.

Rome, consisted in a depreciation of the doctrines of grace. So far, it is, on the other hand, maintained, were the Sectaries which then prevailed in England from proceeding to the extreme which abuses those doctrines, that a leading feature by which, in common, they were distinguished was, their rejection of such tenets; their rejection, or extenuation, of the "doctrines of Original sin, and Predestination, and Election, and adherence to those of Free will and human Merit." Nor is this opinion unsupported by unexceptionable evidence. No testimony of an individual on such points, perhaps, deserves greater attention than that of Mr. Strype. No man seems to have investigated these matters with more diligence, and few have obtained greater credit for integrity. There is a "Testimonial prefixed to the second vol. of his Annals," which is referred to by Bishop Watson[k], "of his ability for writing an ecclesiastical history of the church of England at, and after, the first Reformation, and a recommendation of his work signed by above twenty Bishops." And yet, if we may credit Mr. Strype, they were not abusers of Calvinism, but persons of the very opposite principles. "who first made a separation from the Reformed Church of England in 1550;" who excited the anxiety and exercised the Pens of the principal Reformers in Queen Mary's time; and in short, who constituted the principal Sects that obtained, and were noticed, in 1552, 1562, and 1571, the periods when the articles were especially under consideration; when they were framed, revised, and finally established[l]. The principles, Mr. S. mentions, among those which especially distinguished these Sects, are, that they "held the opinions of the Anabaptists and Pelagians, and violently opposed the doctrine of Predestination;" that they "held *freewill*, man's righteousness, and justification by works; doctrines which the Protestants in the times of

(k) Tracts Index.

(l) See Eccles. Mem. and Annals under these years..

King Edward, for the moſt part, diſowned;" that they "denied the Divinity of Chriſt and of the Holy Ghoſt, the doctrine of Original ſin, Predeſtination and free Election, &c. which the Proteſtants here generally held[m]."

The ſame thing is indeed obvious from another conſideration. The Sectaries againſt whom the Articles are ſaid to have been principally intended are, the Anabaptiſts, and the Puritans[n]. Now that the errors of the Anabaptiſts were on the *Pelagian* ſide of the queſtion, there can be no doubt[o]. And, when the Articles were firſt framed, and, in ſubſtance, made what they now are, the *Puritans* did not exiſt[p]. Nay, there is very ſtrong evidence, that at the time when theſe doctrinal ſtandards aſſumed their preciſe preſent form, no difference had commenced between the Epiſcopal Churchmen, and thoſe afterwards called Puritans, in matters of *doctrine*; but, that the leaders of our Reformed Church were unanimous in decrying the above Anticalviniſtic ſentiments as heretical[q].

Now in proportion as this account of the matter is received, the former one muſt be rejected, and of courſe all reaſonings upon it. But then, our ſyſtem will be equally ſupported upon another principle. In this caſe, as will appear more fully hereafter[r], the prevailing ſentiments of our Reformers were thoſe now uſually termed Calviniſtic, and they are expreſsed with great moderation. Our opponents may admit whether of theſe accounts they pleaſe, they are equally unfriendly to their *extenuating* ſyſtem. If according to the former, and now common repreſentation, it was a principal object with the authors of our forms to guard *againſt Calviniſm*, then certainly they would verge no nearer it than

(m) See Ibid .(n) Above, p. 16. (o) See the 8th. of King Edward's Arts. in the Collection, &c. to Hiſt. of Reformation, p. 210; and Hiſt. itſelf, Vol. ii. p. 110. (p) See Strype's Life of Parker, p. 154. (q) See ibid.; Neal's Hiſt. of the Puritans, p. 137, 162, 268; Roger's Preface to his Expoſ. of the Articles, &c.

(r) Sect. 2nd. of this Chap.

what they deemed eſſential truth; if, according to the latter account, they were themſelves, in the above ſenſe *Calviniſts*, this conſideration will prohibit the ſmalleſt extenuation of the plain meaning of their words. And every one of the ſtatements which have been made, their conceſſions towards the ancient ſyſtem, their rejection of Calviniſm, or their unanimity upon it, militates alſo directly againſt the frequent inſinuation [s], that expreſſions were adopted beyond what was intended in order to accomodate, and to comprehend the Calviniſts.

3. Another method by which we may approach the preciſe doctrines intended to be eſtabliſhed in the written confeſſions of our Church, is, The examination of the OTHER WRITINGS AND DECLARATIONS of her Reformers, on the ſame ſubjects; eſpecially thoſe which were of great publicity, or had the ſanction of authority.

Theſe writings are at once commentaries upon the eſtabliſhed Creed, and in themſelves direct evidences what doctrines were uniformly taught by the framers and impoſers of it. It would indeed greatly exceed the limits of our plan to exhibit here this evidence in its proper force. We will however venture to aſſert, that, from the Acceſſion of Edward when the articles of our faith firſt came under regular diſcuſſion, to the period when they aſſumed their preſent form, and were finally impoſed under Elizabeth, there is no other production either of any collective Body of the chief Agents in the buſineſs, or even of any principal individual among them, that in the ſmalleſt degree reſtricts the moſt full and doctrinal interpretation of theſe articles upon the points in queſtion. Nor did theſe venerable men ever, at any future period, diſcover by their writings any relaxation of the ſentiments here expreſſed. In expatiating upon them more at

(s) See Croft's Bampt. Lect. p. 109; Strictures on Paley p. 58, Antijac. Rev. for January 1800, p. 47.

large, they oftentimes purſued theſe doctrines ſtill further, and went *beyond* what is neceſſarily implied in the eſtabliſhed compendium; but it was left for Divines of another Century to *explain them away*.

We begin with the acceſſion of King Edward, becauſe then only, it is, and muſt be, confeſſed, the legal and regular reformation of our Church commenced. Before that period, as Biſhop Burnet expreſſes the matter, "it was rather conceived than brought forth[t]." Biſhop Pretyman, accordingly, calls Edward the "firſt Proteſtant King of England[v]." The great hero of this work, Cranmer, had before laboured under perpetual and invincible reſtrictions from the auſtere and capricious Henry: and, as might naturally be expected, his own mind, and the minds of his aſſociates, only opened upon the erroneous ſyſtem gradually; and by the ſame gradation advanced toward the perfection of truth. The productions of Henry the Eighth's time are not therefore the proper illuſtrations of our articles. As well might we attempt to illuſtrate the perfections of a man by the half-formed Embryo; as well might we recur to the dawn of the morning to illumine the meridian brightneſs. Theſe publications were indeed excellent in compariſon of what preceded them, and in ſome particulars their doctrines are found; but they notoriouſly, and confeſſedly, retain many of the peculiarities of the Romiſh faith. "In the articles of religion publiſhed by Henry the 8th in 1536," Biſhop Pretyman ſays, "ſome of the Popiſh doctrines are diſclaimed, but others are retained[w]." And, the "neceſſary Doctrine," &c. "printed in 1543," Dr. Hey admits, "has many doctrines of the church of Rome in it[x]." It would therefore be equally warrantable to prove from ſuch writings that theſe Popiſh doctrines are the ſpecific doctrines of our church, as any others on which they differ from what was afterwards

(t) Pref. to 1ſt. Vol. of Hiſt. of Refor. (v) Elements Vol. 2. p. 34.
(w) Ibid. (x) Nor. Lect, Vol. ii. p. 207.

agreed upon. Yet with this confeſſedly POPISH "Neceſſary Doctrine," &c. Dr. Hey[y], Dr. Ridley[z], Mr. Gray[a], Mr. Daubeny[b], the Author of the Oxford Diſſertation[b], and the whole body of theſe Divines, conſtantly attempt to fix and illuſtrate the preciſe doctrines of our church! To theſe *Popiſh and heterogeneous works* of the reign of Henry the Eighth, the whole tribe of our opponents appeal, as to authorities that are indiſputable, while the writings under Elizabeth, of the very period when *our Articles aſſumed their preſent form and authority*, and of the *very perſons* who gave them this form and authority, are ſcarcely once glanced at! And what is very material to be remarked, this appeal is chiefly made on the very ſubject which conſtituted the *fundamental* ground of difference between the two churches, that which reſpects *human merit*, and the proper province of *Grace and Works*[c]! This circumſtance diſcovers no little of the true nature of their cauſe.

But let us ſpecify a few of thoſe works which unqueſtionably merit attention on this head. Among theſe may be mentioned, Firſt, the ARTICLES OF KING EDWARD. Theſe Articles; were prepared, there ſeems no reaſon to doubt[d], by Cranmer and Ridley; reviewed by the other moſt learned Biſhops and Divines; agreed upon in the Convocation of 1552; and the year following made the ſtandard doctrine of our church[e]. And that they verge as near what Dr. Croft calls Enthuſiaſm as thoſe of the Convocation of 1562, which conſtitute our preſent Eccleſiaſtical Standards, is beyond all queſtion. On the important doctrines of Original Sin, Salvation by Grace through Faith, and Good Works, they are either *verbatim* the ſame with this later

(y) Nor Lect. Vol. iii. p. 206, 263, 344, 358, 375, 437, 446, 457, 463, 501, &c. (z) Lett. 2. p. 162. (a) Bampt. Lect. p. 246. (b) Appendix, p. 169, 182, 329, &c. (b) On the 17th. Art. p. 32. (c) See as above, &c. (d) See Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 272; Burnet's Hiſt. of Refor. Vol. ii. p. 166. (e) Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 272.

form, or such as no fair interpreter can possibly set at variance with it [f]. Nay some things, our opponents say, were added in 1562, with the view of softening what is here said on these points [g].

What next perhaps deserves to be noticed is, The CELEBRATED CATECHISM, usually denominated Bishop Ponet's, or Dr. Nowell's. This Catechism, it appears most probable, was prepared by the united efforts of the very persons who prepared the Articles. It is certain that besides one of the above learned and pious Divines, Bishop Ridley, and some others of the most eminent of the English Reformers, assisted in its composition. It was reviewed, approved, and subscribed, by the same Convocation that reviewed, passed, and subscribed the 39 Articles; and was bound up with them. It was recommended by the King's Letters Patent, and enjoined by his Privy Council to be taught to all scholars as the ground and foundation of their learning in true religion [h]. We cannot therefore but consider this work as a very authentic and specific illustration of the original sense of our articles, and of the manner in which the doctrines contained in them were taught by our first reformers. And yet, that this interpretation is exceedingly different from that which we are opposing, few seem to have ventured to deny [i].

A further especial illustration of our subject will be found in The PUBLIC CONFESSIONS AND DECLARATIONS of the Heads of the English Protestant Church, during their imprisonment in Queen Mary's days. If ever men may be supposed incapable of equivocation, and sincere in the avowal of their principles, it must be when, for their adherence to such principles, they are approaching the Stake. Let then any adequate judge impartially attend to the Sum-

---

(f) See them in Burnet's Collection of Records, Vol. i. p. 209, No. 55. (g) Above, p. 52. (h) Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 294; Ecc. Mem. Vol. ii. p. 368. Fuller's Ch. History, B. 7. p. 421. (i) See the Catechism passim.

mary Declaration of faith publiſhed in the firſt year of this inauſpicious reign, and ſubſcribed by thoſe venerable leaders in the noble army of Martyrs, Ferrar, Hooper, Coverdale, Philpot, Taylor, Bradford, Rogers, &c.; which they avowed themſelves ready to maintain to the laſt, and for which moſt of them actually endured the flames[k]: Let him conſult the treatiſes written, ſubſcribed, or approved, by Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Ferrar, Philpot, Bradford, Taylor, and Careleſs, on the firſt diſturbance occaſioned among them by the *Freewillers*, and other Separatiſts, in the priſon of King's Bench[l]: Let him examine the excellent Confeſſion written about two years after by John Clement, at the inſtigation of the other priſoners, then deemed orthodox, and which Mr. Strype ſays "may be looked upon as an account of the Belief of the Profeſſors in thoſe days[m]: Let him, in ſhort, attend to theſe, or any other public Confeſſion of the Church Proteſtants, or of any principal Individual among them, during this whole perſecution, and then declare, as an honeſt man, whoſe doctrines are now moſt ſimilar to them.

Theſe early Productions deſerve the more attention, becauſe it is ſo common to inſinuate, that the interpretation of the Articles now termed Methodiſtic or Calviniſtic, was only introduced by the return of the Exiles[n], on the acceſſion of Elizabeth, and was not in the primary intention of our Church. According to this ſuggeſtion, the above illuſtrations of them, which were written before that

---

(k) See Strype's Eccles. Mem. under 1554. p. 140, and Cat. of Originals, No. 17; Burnet's Hiſt. of Refor. Vol. ii. p. 285; and Fox's Acts of Monuments, Vol. ii. p. 1641, where the Declara is more perfect.

(l) Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 350; Appendix, p. 195, No. 83; Eccles. Mem; Coverdale's Letters of the Martyrs; and Fox.

(m) Eccles. Mem. Vol. iii. p. 363.; Cat. of Origin. No. 61.

(n) See Heylin's Quinq. Hiſt. Tracts, p. 609; Dr. Hey's Nor. Lect. Vol. ii. p. 209; Daub. Appen. p. 230; &c.

period, muſt exhibit the moſt moderate view of their doctrines. Dr. Heylin appears to labour to prove, that the doctrines afterwards eſtabliſhed, were not deſigned to be, what are ſometimes called, more rigid[o]. It is ſufficient to our purpoſe if they were not intended to be *leſs* ſo, which will ſcarcely be much conteſted with us.—But, as the deciſions under Elizabeth are thoſe which are binding upon Miniſters now, to a few of the moſt authentic and important theological publications under her reign, we will particularly appeal.

The firſt we will notice is, A "Declaration" of the Proteſtants' doctrine drawn up, and ſubſcribed, by Sandys, and the other eminent Divines, met in Conference at Weſtminſter, for the purpoſe of preparing the Book of Common Prayer, in the year 1559. This Declaration is nothing elſe than a republication, and explanatory enlargement, of the Articles of King Edward; and the reaſon aſſigned by themſelves why they do not adopt the very words of thoſe Articles, is, "that they were led to particularize againſt the objections of their adverſaries:" But, as they think proper to add, "that in altering, augmenting or diminiſhing, adding or omitting, they neither *improve*, nor yet *recede* from any of the ſaid articles; but fully conſent unto the *whole*, as to a moſt true and ſound Doctrine, grounded upon God's Word[p]." There is manifeſtly therefore no infringement of our ſyſtem here.

The ſame may be affirmed of the CONFESSION to which the ſubſcription of the Clergy was required in the following year[q]; and, in ſhort, of every work either of eminence or authority, which preceded the regular Settlement of our 39 Articles in their preſent form in 1562[r].

And what the preciſe doctrines then deſigned in them were, we have as full evidence as the nature of the caſe is

(o) Quinc. Hiſt. Tracts, p. 597. (p) See Strype's Annals of the Reforma. p. 114. (q) Ibid. p. 207. 209. (r) See Strype's Life of Parker, p. 120.

well capable of, in the CATECHISM that was reviewed, corrected, "approved and allowed," by the same Convocation, which passed them. This Catechism, it seems clear, as Mr. Strype concludes from internal evidence, is only an improved Edition of that we have already noticed, which passed the Synod of 1552; or at the least, much use has been made of this former work in its composition. It was now drawn up at the instigation of the great Secretary Cecil, by the eminently learned and pious Dr. Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's, who was Prolocutor of the Convocation in which it, and the 39 Articles were passed. It underwent the most careful and mature examination and discussion of the most celebrated Divines in the Kingdom, with the express view, that it might be "a standing summary of the Doctrines professed in our church." When it was printed, it was subscribed by the two Arch-Bishops, dedicated, to them, and to the Bishop of London, by *name*, and to all the rest of the Bishops. It passed in a short space, through several editions, and was translated into different languages. It was commonly used in schools. And, in short, in such high estimation was it holden, on its first coming abroad, and for many years after, by Parker, Whitgift, Cooper, and the other Dignitaries of our church, that it was even enjoined to be studied by Ministers, in order "that they might learn true divinity from it[s]." And to crown the whole, its importance has been recognized, and its worth extolled by two eminent modern Prelates, Bishop Cleaver[t], and the Bishop of Durham[v]. No testimony can therefore be more deserving of attention in our inquiry. And yet none can be more decisive in our favour. We appeal to

---

(s) See Strype's Annals, p. 313—316; Life of Parker, p. 122, 301.
(t) See Preface, p. 6. to his Edit. of it, or below § 2.
(v) See his Charge, 1792, 2nd Edit. Appendix, p. 54; and the Oxford Encheiridion Ecclesiasticum.

every page, to every paragraph, to every ſingle ſentence of it.

Another Work of great publicity and importance at this period was, THE FAMOUS APOLOGY FOR THE ENGLISH CHURCH, written by Biſhop Jewel. This Prelate, Biſhop Burnet affirms [w], and it ſeems the general ſentiment, "was the firſt, and much the beſt, writer of Elizabeth's time." He "had a great ſhare in all that was then done, particularly in compiling the Second Book of Homilies [w]." "His Works" therefore, his Lordſhip juſtly obſerves, may with "great reaſon" be conſidered "as a very ſure commentary on our articles [o]." But the work which eſpecially immortalized his name, and which moſt demands our preſent attention, is this celebrated Apology. It was written at the inſtigation, and by the common advice, of the whole body of Divines that were aſſembled for the purpoſe of effecting the Reformation. Its expreſs object was, to exhibit the real and preciſe doctrines of our church; to ſhow her agreement, in matters of faith, with the German, the Helvetian, the French, and the other Reformed churches; and to refute the objections of the adverſaries of theſe doctrines. In this character, as the avowed Creed of the Church of England, extracts from it appeared in the Harmony of the Confeſſions of Eleven Proteſtant Churches that was publiſhed in the year 1581. It paſſed through many editions, and was publiſhed, both at home and abroad, in various languages. It was repeatedly vindicated, when attacked by the enemies of the church, and contributed more, it is believed, towards its eſtabliſhment than any other publication of the age. And, as Hiſtorians aſſure us, in ſuch equal eſteem, and of ſuch equal authority, with the 39 Articles themſelves, was it in thoſe days holden, that a deſign was entertained of its being joined with them [x].

(w w) Pref. to Expo. of Arts. p. 3. (o) Ibid. (x) See Strype's Annals, p. 249. Life of Parker, p. 179.

This work therefore muſt alſo afford very important evidence upon the point in queſtion; and the interpretation of our eccleſiaſtical ſtandards which it favours, is unqueſtionably that which was intended by the original framers and impoſers of them. Yet to this alſo we moſt readily and confidently appeal.

It would be eaſy to enumerate many other publications to the ſame effect; we will however confine ourſelves to one more. This ſhall be, THE ANALYSIS OF the 39 ARTICLES by the Reverend Thomas Rogers, Rector of Horninger in Suffolk. This was the firſt regular commentary upon the Articles, and the only one that appeared during the preſent reign. The general unanimity of ſentiment reſpecting their true ſenſe, for ſome time, rendered ſuch works unneceſſary. It carries upon the face of it a teſtimony, that it was "peruſed, and by the lawful authority of the church, allowed to be public[y]." It was dedicated to two ſucceſſive Arch-Biſhops of Canterbury; the firſt edition of it in 1584 to Arch-Biſhop Whitgift, by whom Dr. Fuller tells us, it was countenanced[z]; and the ſecond in 1607 to Arch-Biſhop Bancroft, whoſe Chaplain the Author was[a]. In this dedication, and the work itſelf, Mr. R. ſhows, that the undoubted doctrine and invariable intention of our church in her articles, were always according to the *preciſe and expreſs words* of thoſe articles; that in no other ſenſe they were ever underſtood by his Grace's moſt venerable predeceſſors Whitgift, Grindal, Parker, Cranmer, or any other of the renowned Divines and Fathers of our Church; that in this light they were viewed, and acquieſced in, by the Brethren and Puritans themſelves; nay, that this interpretation correſponded with the "Confeſſions of all the Reformed Churches in Chriſtendom[b]."

(y) See Title-page, and Preface near the end. (z) Ch. Hiſt. B. 9. p. 173. (a) See the Dedication. (b) Ibid. toward the end.

It is needleſs to ſay whoſe ſyſtem all this ſupports. The doctrines, which, in Mr. Roger's judgment, the words of the articles naturally import; and which, he ſays were all approved for true and Chriſtian, by the lawful and public allowance of the church, at that time, are clearly *Calviniſtic* [c]. Fuller indeed ſays that ſome Proteſtants were offended at this interpretation, and complained that Mr. R. had confined the charitable latitude before allowed in the articles [d]: But, as Dr. Ridley is conſtrained to admit [e], the hiſtorian gives *no proof* of ſuch a circumſtance. Nor does it appear a fact, that the *doctrinal part* of the book was unacceptable, except to the aiders and abetters of Popery: But admitting the objection, it does not reach our premiſes.

But, if all theſe other approved and public theological works of our moſt diſtinguiſhed Reformers and early Divines thus individually, collectively, and unequivocally, breathe one ſpirit, teach one doctrine, and favour our ſenſe of the eſtabliſhed Confeſſion, there can remain little doubt either what the genuine doctrines of the Reformation were, or who they are that adhere to theſe doctrines.

4. Still further light may however be obtained on the ſubject by conſidering, The AUTHORITIES our Reformers had regard to in their important Work. It does not indeed by any means follow, as ſome appear abſurdly to have concluded [f], that in *all* points of doctrine they neceſſarily agreed with every Proteſtant Divine of whom they ſpoke with approbation, or with whom they held a friendly intercourſe. Our own times afford ample evidence that men of the moſt diſcordant doctrinal ſentiments may very cordially unite againſt what they eſteem a corrupt Eſtabliſhment. If therefore in the Book of Martyrology, which was enjoined

(c) See the Book. (d) Ch. Hiſt. B. 9. p. 72, 73. (e) 3d Lett. to Conf. p. 16. See alſo the Confeſſional, Edit. 3. p. 232—235. (f) See the War that has been continually waged, Whether Calvin or Melancthon had a greater hand in our Reforma.; Heylin's Quinq. Hiſt, Tracts, p. 548; Toplady's Hiſtoric Proofs of the Doctrinal Calv. of the Ch. of England, p. 367, &c.; &c.

to be had in Churches, ſome things may be found inimical to our Ritual, and the Epiſcopal Habit[g]; or if in Eraſmus' Paraphraſe which attained the ſame honour[h], the interpretation in ſome particulars ſcarcely reaches the prevalent doctrines of thoſe times, on this principle, the circumſtance is eaſily accounted for. Both theſe Works contained many things that were excellent, and in an eſpecial manner tended to promote the main object of a ſeparation from Rome. For theſe reaſons they were deſervedly eſteemed and recommended to eſpecial notice. But it does not follow that every thing contained in them coincided exactly with the Reformers' ſentiments. That Eraſmus' doctrines were not *wholly* approved is indeed declared in the Epiſtle dedicatory prefixed to the tranſlation of his Paraphraſe on the Acts. But after this writer's judgment, "a little trip among ſo many notable good works for the interpretation of ſcripture, and for the help of the ſimple, ſhould rather be borne withal, than ſo many good things, to be either rejected or kept away from the hungry and Chriſtian reader." And beyond all doubt, his Works ſhould be received with ſome qualification, who, as his Biographer informs us, could exclaim, "that he abhorred the Reformers[i]; and could frequently revile them with the utmoſt virulence. If however our opponents will have it[k], that becauſe this Paraphraſe was placed in Churches, the Reformers could not hold any opinions which are diſapproved in it, they muſt, for the ſame reaſon, conclude from Fox's Book, that our Reformers were a kind of *Puritans!*

(g) See Fox's Acts and Mon. p. 1366; and Quinq. Hiſt. p. 613, 614. (h) Ibid. p. 548. (i) See Jortin's Life Eraſmus, p. 608, 442, 481. (k) See Dr. Hey's Nor. Lect. Vol. ii. p. 208. Vol. iii. p. 502; Daubeny's Appendix, p. 203, 211, 244. Mr. D. ſuppoſes that hence an argument againſt our ſyſtem ariſes which is unanſwerable, becauſe when Eraſmus obtained this honour, "Luther had publiſhed a Commetary on Galatians, and Calvin his Inſtitutes." But who knows not that Luther held different notions from our Reformers on the *Sacrament*, and Calvin on *Diſcipline?*

Doubtleſs then, their conduct in reſpect to both theſe Works, is to be interpreted on the principle juſt mentioned; and with an eye to the ſame principle muſt their expreſſions of approbation be taken in many other inſtances.

The general Doctrines of the Reformation muſt however reflect ſome light upon the preciſe views of the founders of our church; and thoſe Works, and Authors, which they continually quote, and refer to, for the illuſtration of their ſentiments, muſt afford very important evidence on the ſubject. We appeal then alſo, upon the points in queſtion, to the WRITINGS OF LUTHER [l], the renowned Leader, and acknowledged Chief, in the great Tranſaction; to the WHOLE BODY OF THE CONFESSIONS OF ALL the Reformed Churches [m]; to the Authorities which, next to the ſacred Scriptures, our Reformers eſpecially profeſſed to reſpect, the PRIMITIVE CHURCH [n], and THE WORKS OF ST. AUSTIN [o]. No human authority had certainly ſo great weight with them, or was ſo frequently reſorted to by them, as that of Auſtin. "I am well aſſured," ſaid Biſhop Carleton, who was one of the four Engliſh Divines choſen by King James to aſſiſt at the Synod of Dort, "that the learned Biſhops, who were in the Reformation, in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, did ſo much honour St. Auguſtine, that, in the collecting of the Articles and Homilies, and other things in that Reformation, they had an eſpecial reſpect unto St. Auguſtine's doctrines [p]." "It is not to be denied," proceeds Biſhop Burnet, "but that the Article,"

(l) See e. g. his Treatiſe De Servo Arbitrio, and his Commentarium in Gal.; with Burnet's Expo. of Arts. p. 150—152. (m) See The Harmony of Eleven Proteſtant Churches, publiſhed 1581, and the Body of Confeſſions of Sixteen Churches, publiſhed 1612; Rogers on the 39 Arts.; Bingham's Apology of the French Church for the Eng. Church. (n) See Milner's Hiſt. of the Ch. during the three firſt Centuries; Bp. Beveridge's, and Welchman's, Expo. of Arts. (o) See the following Notes to (v). (p) Examina. of Mountague, p. 49.

namely the 17th, "seems to be framed according to St. Austin's Doctrine." ... "The three cautions that are added to it, do likewise intimate that St. Austin's Doctrine was designed to be settled by the Article;" they "relate very visibly to the same opinion [q]." "In England," adds Mr. Tindal the Historian, "The Articles of religion are a plain transcript of St. Austin's Doctrine, in the controverted points of original sin, predestination, justification by faith alone, efficacy of grace, and good works [r]." And to produce but one evidence more, from a whole host, "This," saith the eminent Dr. Ward, another of our Plenipotentiaries at Dort, "can I truly add for a conclusion, that the Church of England from the beginning of the reformation, and this our famous University, with all those who from thence till now, have with us enjoyed the Divinity Chair, if we except one foreign Frenchman [s], have constantly adhered to St. Austin, in these points [t]; namely, those just enumerated. But what however is more convincing in the case, than ten thousand other evidences, we have ocular demonstration in the Works of our Reformers, of their great use of this distinguished Prelate's Writings, and of their high respect for his doctrines [v]. We stop not here to show precisely what these doctrines are. No *Divine* can be ignorant of them. And they who really know them, must know also that they are the very essence of what is now called *Methodism*.

Mr. Daubeny however, is above following such a Guide, and professedly maintains a different system. "For my own part," says "this vigilant guardian of our established faith, this intrepid champion of the doctrines of the Church of England [o]," this zealous opposer of Election, "I do not

(q) Expo. of Arts. p. 168. See also Ibid. p. 114, and Preface, p. 1.
(r) Continuation of Rapin, Vol. iii. p. 275. (s) Peter Baro.
(t) Concio ad Clerum Cambridge, 1625, p. 45. (v) See Homilies; Cranmer's Discourse of faith, &c.; Jewel's Apology; &c
(o) Antijac. Aug. 1800, p. 438.

take my faith from the writings of Luther, Calvin, or the more ancient profeſſor of this doctrine, St. Auguſtin [w]."

We would however here aſk this Gentleman, by the way, how he can attempt to perſuade his reader, that "by an appeal to hiſtoric fact," he has brought him "acquainted with the circumſtances which accompanied the original eſtabliſhment of our preſent Church doctrine," and "qualified him to form a decided opinion on the ſubject [x];" when this "hiſtoric fact" conſiſts, of quotations from *Books full of Popery*, written many years before the regular reformation of our Church commenced [y], quotations which affirm that "*Good-Works* be the very ſervice of God, and be MERITORIOUS towards the attaining of everlaſting life [z];" of a few detached paſſages, that are perfectly *equivocal* [a]; and of other mere ſecond-hand ſcraps taken from avowed *partizans* in the buſineſs [b]; and when ſcarcely *one of thoſe great Works* we have mentioned, which, beyond all queſtion, were ſo intimately connected with the "original eſtabliſhment of our preſent Church doctrine," is even *affirmed to exiſt!* How is this reconcileable with common integrity? And how is it that ſo many of our opponents, in ſome degree, imitate this writer? Did they never hear of this *great uſe of Auſtin;* of *the Work that paſſed the Convocation along with the Articles, and was bound up with them, in* 1552; of the *writings of our Biſhops and Martyrs in Priſon, Nowell's Catechiſm, Jewel's Apology, and the other authentic, and publicly approved Works* of our *principal Reformers, at the time of our Reformation?* Why then is this unimpeachable evidence on the queſtion almoſt *wholly ſuppreſſed?* And why do they continually weary us with ſuch *equivocal and illegitimate teſtimony* [c]*?*

(w) Guide p. 91. but ſee the whole 5th Diſc. and his Appendix. (x) Appendix, p. 262. (y) Ibid. p. 169,, 187, 203, 329, &c.; and above, p. 57 ſee. (z) Appendix, p. 329. (a) See ibid. p. 201—209. (b) Heylin, Mr. Fletcher, Dr. Hey, &c. (c) See above, p. 57.

SECTION II.

The true interpretation of the Articles further ſought from the known PRIVATE SENTIMENTS *of our Reformers.*

THE laſt illuſtration of the genuine ſenſe of our conſtituted forms of doctrine, I ſhall mention, is, The known private ſentiments of thoſe who compiled and impoſed them. Theſe ſentiments we mean to ſhow were thoſe which are now uſually termed *Calviniſtic*. Out of the multiplicity of evidence by which this fact might be eſtabliſhed, I will ſelect, as ſufficiently deciſive, only the following.

1. Firſt, The UNANIMOUS TESTIMONY of men of all ſentiments, and of the utmoſt reſpectability.—Upon this point bears that which we have already adduced to prove the articles *Auguſtinian*. For, however Calvin might expreſs himſelf more deciſively on ſome points of doctrine than Auſtin had done, or might even differ from him, thoſe who now only adhere to *Auſtin* are called *Calviniſts*. "When this doctrine," ſaith Mr. Daubeny, "now diſtinguiſhed by the title of Calviniſtic, was firſt broached by *Auſtin*, it was reckoned an hereſy [d]." So alſo in the paſſage already cited [z], reprobating Election, &c. as taught by "Luther" and "Calvin," he ſays, "or the more ancient profeſſor of this doctrine, St. Auguſtin."—All "other differences," except thoſe which reſpect Baptiſm, Biſhop Burnet teaches, "between St. Auſtin's Doctrine, and that of the Sublapſarians, are but *forced* ſtrains to repreſent him and the Calviniſts as of different principles [y]."—"Calvin," Biſhop Pretyman accordingly adds, "nearly followed *Auſtin* and the Latin Church [x]."—But our witneſſes ſhall ſpeak directly to the

(d) Appendix, p. 400. (z) page 68. (y) On Arts. p. 149. (x) Elements, Vol. ii. p. 312. See alſo Biſhop Watſon's Charge, 1795. p. 68.

point. We will begin with a man equally unprejudiced in favour of any ſyſtem of revealed doctrines,

The celebrated hiſtorian Mr. Hume. "The firſt Reformers in England," he ſays, "as in other European countries, had embraced the moſt rigid tenets of predeſtination and abſolute decrees, and had compoſed upon that ſyſtem, all the articles of their religious Creed [e]." And in another place, ſpeaking of the ſame doctrines, "All the firſt Reformers," he ſays, "adopted theſe principles [f]."

Hear next the equally well-known Dr. Moſheim [g], whoſe expreſs object it was to make a faithful record of ſuch particulars.—"After the death of Henry," relates this learned Church Hiſtorian concerning our nation, "the Univerſities, Schools, and Churches, became the oracles of Calviniſm.... Hence it happened, that, when it was propoſed, under the reign of Edward the ſixth to give a fixed and ſtable turn to the doctrine and diſcipline of the Church, Geneva was acknowledged as a Siſter-Church, and the theological ſyſtem there eſtabliſhed by Calvin, was adopted, and rendered the public rule of faith in England. This, however, was done, without any change of the form of Epiſcopal Government [h]." The ſame ſentiment he repeats a little after in theſe words; "It is certain that the Calviniſtical doctrine of predeſtination prevailed among the firſt Engliſh Reformers, the greateſt part of whom were at leaſt Sublapſarians [i]."

The depoſitions of another claſs of hiſtorians, the conductors of the New Annual Regiſter, run thus: Speaking of the preciſe periods when our articles were agreed upon in convocation, and confirmed by Parliament, "The tenets," they ſay, "commonly received then, and indeed ſupported by the 39 Articles, were thoſe commonly called Calviniſtical.

(e) Hiſt. of Eng. Vol. vi. p. 273. (f) Ibid. p. 166. (g) "For an account of this controverſy" (the Calvinian) Biſhop Pretyman ſays, "ſee *Moſheim*." Elements, Vol. ii. p. 312. (h) Eccles. Hiſtory, Vol. iv. p. 87. (i) Ibid. p. 88.

In theſe opinions there was ſuch an almoſt univerſal concurrence that we meet with only *one* perſon[k] of any conſideration in this reign, who advanced ſentiments approaching to what afterwards went under the name of Arminianiſm; and ſuch was the clamour raiſed againſt him, that he retired from his Profeſſorſhip[l]."

"The opinion of Calvin," the Critical Reviewers ſay, "was the doctrine of the early Fathers of the Church, and was generally maintained till the time of Biſhop Burnet, by the members of the Church of England[y]."

"Of all the Reformed Churches," adds the elegant Dr. Robertſon, "that of England has deviated leaſt from the ancient inſtitutions. . . . Though the Articles to be recognized as the ſyſtem of national faith were framed conformable to the doctrines of *Calvin*, his notions with reſpect to Church government and the mode of worſhip were not adopted[z]."

Biſhop Burnet's teſtimony is equally ſhort and deciſive. "In England," ſaith his lordſhip, "the FIRST REFORMERS were GENERALLY in the *Sublapſarian* hypotheſis; but Perkins and others aſſerted the *Supralapſarian* way[m]."

The ſame, in effect, ſay Maclaine[n], Strype[o], Wilſon[p], Smollett[q], and numberleſs others. In ſhort, as the learned

---

(k) Peter Baro, Lady Margaret's Profeſſor of Divinity at Cambridge.
(l) New Annual Regiſter for 1789. (y) June, 1800, p. 223.
(z) Hiſtory of America, p. 163. (m) Expoſ. of Arts. p. 151. The Sublapſarians ſuppoſe, that, the elect were choſen, and the reſt of mankind paſſed by, as *fallen-creatures*, or *ſinners;* and attempt not to account for the difficulties which attend the ſubject when purſued beyond a certain limit. The Supralapſarians proceed further, ſpeak more deciſively reſpecting the Divine *Decree* in the fall of Adam, &c. and ſuppoſe that in the Act of Election, &c. God merely conſidered men as *creatures*. This ſeems agreeable to his Lordſhip's account. They were in common, however, he ſays, called "*Calviniſts*." Ibid.
(n) Note on Moſheim's Hiſt. Vol. ii. p. 571. (o) Eccles. Mem. and Annals. (p) Vol. ii. p. 753. (q) Hiſt. Vol. vii. p. 80.

author of the Confeſſional obſerves, that theſe ſentiments obtained during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and for ſome part of the reign of King James the firſt, (which includes the period when our Articles were ſettled as they ſtill remain) is a fact in which our hiſtorical writers of all parties agree[r]. None of thoſe we have mentioned were themſelves Calviniſts, but barely relate the matter, on their credit, as critics and hiſtorians.

And what credit is not due to the venerable teſtimony of Davenant[s], Carleton[t], Hall[v], Ward[w], Uſher[x], Whitaker[y], and the whole claſs of writers of their deſcription? Theſe worthies lived when they had the beſt opportunity of knowing the truth on the ſubject; their high ſtations in the church rendered it their firſt duty carefully to attend to it; their undoubted piety would not ſuffer them either to neglect that duty, or to be guilty of miſrepreſentation: Yet, they both held theſe ſentiments themſelves, and are unanimous in declaring, that they were the common ſentiments of the Founders of our Church. The laſt-mentioned of theſe moſt unimpeachable authorities ſhall ſpeak for the whole company, while the reſt ſtand by to ſanction what is ſaid. "The Church of England," ſaith the eminent Whitaker, ſpeaking of the Calviniſtic opinion, "ever ſince the goſpel was reſtored, hath *always* held this opinion: This, Bucer in our Univerſity, and Peter Martyr at Oxford, profeſſed; and moſt abundantly watered our Church with their ſtreams, in the days of King Edward: This opinion their auditors in both our Univerſities, the Biſhops, Deans, and other Divines, who upon the advancement of our famous Queen Elizabeth

(r) Chap. 7. p. 270. (s) See his "Animadverſions on Hoord," p. 5, 7, 8; His Letter to Dr. Ward, in Fuller's Ch. Hiſt. B. 11. p. 139. (t) See his Examination of Montague, paſſim. (v) See his Letter to Biſhop Davenant, freeing himſelf from the charge of Arminianiſm. (w) See his Letter to Archbiſhop Uſher in Uſher's Letters, n. 127. (x) See his Sermon before the King, June 27, 1627. (y) See his Cygnea Cantio, p. 15, &c. Camb. 1593.

to the Crown, returned either from exile, or were releaſed from their priſons; thoſe by whom our Church was reformed, our religion eſtabliſhed, popery thruſt out, and quite deſtroyed; (all of which we may remember, though few of this kind be yet living) this opinion, I ſay, they themſelves have held, and commended unto us: In this faith have they lived, in this they died, in this they always wiſhed that we ſhould conſtantly continue [z]."

And what, now we aſk, but the irreſiſtible force of truth, could induce men of ſuch oppoſite principles, and in ſuch oppoſite ſituations, Believers and Infidels, Churchmen and Diſſenters, Natives and Foreigners, Calviniſts and Arminians, thus to unite in their teſtimony on the point? Muſt we not ceaſe to expect any authentic information from hiſtory, if, to a conſiderable extent, credit is not due to ſuch evidence as this?

And is there after all no juſt foundation for the idea? Is it a mere whim of a few modern Enthuſiaſts? Or did theſe ſentiments only obtain at ſome *after period* of our church with which our Reformers had no concern, and which conſequently does not concern us? So ſome perſons would have it believed!

2. The fact however is abundantly confirmed by the WRITINGS OF THE REFORMERS THEMSELVES. Nearly all thoſe to which we have already referred, tend directly to its eſtabliſhment. The reſt are in perfect conſiſtency with it. Nothing need be more deciſive on the ſubject, than the declarations and confeſſions of our Proteſtant Biſhops and Martyrs in priſon. And theſe muſt be conſidered the genuine ſentiments of the *firſt Founders* of our church. The baniſhed Exiles could not yet have imported with their return the foreign admixture. Innumerable other productions of the reigns of Edward, Elizabeth, James, and Charles the Firſt, equally full to the purpoſe, might however be

(z) Ibid.

ſpecified; but to avoid unneceſſary prolixity I will only dwell a little on three of theſe.

One of them ſhall be NOWELL'S CATECHISM already ſo largely noticed. I ſelect this work on account of the honour put upon it, and the uſe made of it, by the learned Biſhop Cleaver. This Prelate has favoured the church with an edition of this Catechiſm. He has extolled its excellence, and recognized its importance, by relating a conſiderable part of its ordinary hiſtory. He has moreover acknowledged its Calviniſm, which he has written notes to palliate. Yet, hence, however, his Lordſhip deduces an argument that Calviniſm was not intended to be eſtabliſhed in our Articles. Read the venerable Dignitary's own words at large. Having a long time been laudably meditating a production which might tend to the encreaſe of ſacred learning,

"Quod," he ſays, "in votis tantum diu habui, id tandem paucis abhinc annis deſcriptum videbam ab eruditiſſimo Præſule in 'Codice juris Eccleſiaſtici Anglicani:' Catechiſmum nempe illum, *quem Edwardus Sextus Regia authoritate in ſcholis doceri juſſit*, et quem *Convocationem illam anno* 1562 *recenſuiſſe*, et cum emendationibus atque additamentis promulgaviſſe exiſtimavit Præſul eruditiſſimus; ut tractatus iſte, qui jam ſummam Religionis Reformatæ complectebatur, Clero Juniori norma foret et regula, qua dirigerentur ſtudia illorum Theologica.

"Nec profecto aut fruſtra, aut injucunde quærenti mihi ceſſit res, quamvis enim catechiſmum illum Edwardi Sexti alii tribuunt Johanni Poynet, primum Epiſcopo Roffenſi, et poſtea Wintonienſi, alii Nowello, hunc tamen, quem a Convocatione anno 1562 recenſitum eſſe atque cum emendationibus promulgatum exiſtimavit Præſul doctiſſimus, plane mihi compertum eſt hortatu ſummi illius Viri Gulielmi Cecil, tunc temporis e Secretis Reginæ Elizabethæ, a Nowello ſcriptum fuiſſe, atque *juſſu aut unanimi ſaltem approbatione* domus inferioris Convocationis, Prolocutor cujus ipſe tum fuit anno 1562, ſeſſione 22da ad ſuperiorem domum

ab ipso prolatum. Constat tamen domum superiorem nihil deinde in hac re feciſſe: nec ante annum post octavum Catechiſmus hic publici juris factus fuit, quando, *efflagitantibus Archiepiſcopis*, typis mandabatur patrocinio etiam *omnium Epiſcoporum* cohoneſtatus.

"Et ſane eum eſſe hunc Catechiſmum, qui univerſam Eccleſiæ laudem meruit, facile agnoſcent ii omnes, quibus probe cognita fuerit Vera Catholicæ et incorruptæ fidei doctrina. De eo verba magni Præſulis Archiepiſcopi Whitgift digniſſima ſunt, quæ recitentur: 'Neminem profecto adeo doctum eſſe ſcio, quem non deceat legere et perlegere eruditum illum, et neceſſarium librum.' Quibus liceat ſubjungere illa Thomæ Cooper, Epiſcopi tunc temporis Lincolnienſis. 'Qui Catechiſmum quærunt, eos remitto ad illum, quem ſcripſit pius ille et eruditus Vir, Magiſter Nowell, *ab Eccleſia Anglicana receptum ac approbatum*, verbo Dei fundatum atque confirmatum; in quo videre eſt omnes religionis partes ſtabilitas, difficultates enucleatas, veritatem vindicatam, et corrupta Eccleſiæ Romanæ commenta abjudicata[c]."

Who then would not ſuppoſe that the doctrines of this Catechiſm were conſidered perfectly agreeable to the doctrines of our articles? His Lordſhip however immediately proceeds, "Porro non parum lucis in explicandis 39 Fidei et Religionis Articulis præbiturus eſt hic Catechiſmus, quum ex hoc plane conſtare poſſit Convocationem Anglicanam nolle Calvinianas Scripturarum interpretationes, quicquid de iis tunc temporis ſenſerint non pauci, iidemque magni nominis Viri, lege ſancire. Quod ut lectori manifeſtum fiat, velim cum hoc Catechiſmo conferat Articulos prædictos, atque iſtos ſpeciatim, in quibus de Peccato Originis et de Prædeſtinatione tractatum eſt. Tunc ſcilicet conſtabit, quam caute agitur in iſtis Articulis a Clero ſubſcribendis, dum Nowellus noſter clare et libere ſententiam ſuam, eandemque *Epiſcoporum conſenſu* munitam eloquitur.

(c) Preface, p. 4, 5.

Qua de causa præcipue annotationes hic illic addendas volui, ne articulorum isti interpretationi patrocinari viderer, quam avide adeo captant hodierni quidam, quasi eam, eamque solam subscribendam voluerit Convocatio ista, cui forsan debetur, quod hodie puram adeo fidem ac disciplinam præstet Ecclesia nostra, nemini temere religionis communionem denegatura [d]."

The moderation and wisdom of this celebrated Synod are abundantly conspicuous. But how a confessedly Calviniſtic Catechism, circumstanced even as his Lordship represents this to have been, can afford an argument against the Calviniſtic intention and interpretation of our Articles, some persons will be hard to convince: How a Catechism which according to Mr. Strype, was reviewed, corrected, "*approved, allowed, and passed*," by *both houses* of the same Convocation which reviewed and passed our present Articles [e], can be supposed to contain any other doctrine than that intended in these Articles, such persons do not conceive.—Admitting however that this Work was understood to be more Calviniſtic than the Articles, and that this was the reason why it was not *established by law* for the subscription of the Clergy, it proves beyond all room for question, according to Bishop C.'s account of it, our present position, namely, that the prevailing *private* sentiments of our leading Reformers were Calviniſtic.—And thus does this Catechism show not only that we ought not to descend *below* the plain and full meaning of the Words of the Articles, for which we before appealed to it; but also, how generally sentiments obtained at the time of the Reformation, still *further distant* from those of many modern Divines.

A similar reason may determine our choice of the next Instance, which shall be, the Confession of Lord Bacon. This Mr. Haggitt considers a "most orthodox confession of faith," and a proof that "this great man" was not "less

(d) Ibid. p. 6. (e) See above, p. 63.

eminent for his piety, than for his other choice endowments," although "on the ſcore of profound knowledge and univerſal ſcience, he was perhaps never equalled," even at Cambridge[z]. It is alſo thus introduced in the 'Scholar armed:' "We begin with an excellent ſketch of the Chriſtian plan, by the maſterly hand of the great Lord Chancellor Bacon; who, with his other high qualifications, was one of the beſt Divines of the age in which he flouriſhed[y]."—What then were Lord Bacon's ideas on our ſubject?

"I believe," this great Philoſopher ſpeaking of God, ſays, "that he choſe, according to his good pleaſure, man to be that creature, to whoſe nature the perſon of the eternal Son of God ſhould be united; and *amongſt the generation of men*, ELECTED A SMALL FLOCK, in whom, by the participation of himſelf, he purpoſed to expreſs the riches of his glory; all the miniſtration of angels, damnation of devils and reprobates, and univerſal adminiſtration of all creatures, and diſpenſation of all times, having no other end, but as the ways and ambages of God, to be further glorified in his ſaints, who are one with their head the Mediator, who is one with God[x]."

"I believe," he further ſays, "that the ſufferings and merits of Chriſt, as they are ſufficient to do away the ſins of the whole world, ſo they are only effectual to thoſe which are regenerate by the Holy Ghoſt; who breatheth *where he will of free grace;* which grace, as a ſeed incorruptible, quickeneth the ſpirit of man, and conceiveth him anew a ſon of God and member of Chriſt[w]."—So alſo, after enumerating the ordinary means by which "the work of the Spirit" is effected, "All which," he ſays, "though ſome be more principal, God uſeth as the means of vocation and converſion of his *elect;* not derogating from his power to call immediately by his grace, and at all hours and moments

(z) Viſitation Sermon, p. 9. (y) Vol. i. Preface. (x) Works, Vol. iv. p. 454. (w) Ibid. p. 456.

of the day, that is, of man's life, according to his good pleasure [r]." In conformity with these passages are his notions of the "Catholic Church of God, which is Christ's spouse, and Christ's body." This he represents as consisting "of the spirits of the faithful dissolved, and the spirits of the faithful militant, and of the names yet to be born, which are already written in the book of Life [s]."

And does all this harmonize with the phraseology of certain modern Divines? Does this afford Mr. Haggitt good ground for triumphing in Lord Bacon's authority against Calvinists? Does Lord Bacon, like Mr. H., class "the doctrine of partial election," among positions which are "so horrid and so strange, that when we see them authorized by the names of grave respectable characters, we are ready to reject the attestation of our own senses [t]!" Must we not indeed reject the attestation of our senses to admit this? Yet on the same occasion upon which Mr. H. extols Lord Bacon's Confession, he gives this account of Election!

My last Instance shall be, The PETITION presented by Thomas Talbot, and his Brethren in sentiment, to the Convocation that settled our Articles; the occasion and circumstances of which, Mr. Strype relates as follows: Observing upon the 17th Article, under the year 1562, No mention, he supposes, is made in it of "*absolute Reprobation*," that no Protestant might scruple to sign it; because, he says, "there were among those who now professed the Gospel, and had suffered persecution for it under Queen Mary, *considerable numbers* differing from the *rest* that followed some foreign Divines of great name, in the point of Predestination.... One of these, was Thomas Talbot Parson of St. Mary Magdalen, Milk-Street, London. Those of this persuasion,"

(r) Ibid. p. 456. (t) Ibid. p. 457. (s) See Visitation Sermon, p. 11, and Preface, p. 14. The passage Mr. H. quotes from this Author, according to his Lordship's own express words, "WHOLLY *pertaineth to them* which impugn our present Ecclesiastical *Government*." It is therefore *wholly* inapplicable to the persons here vindicated.

(r) See Works, Vol. iv. p. 468.

he adds, "were mightily cried out againſt by the others, as Freewillers, Pelagians, Papiſts, Anabaptiſts, &c." and "threatened with puniſhment." They therefore preſented a petition to the Biſhops, plainly declaring their opinions and ſufferings, and begging for toleration[n].—Here then, in thoſe who followed the foreign Divines, and theſe who differed from them, and were cried out againſt, we have clearly the *whole Body* of the Engliſh Proteſtants, except a few extravagant Sectaries. By examining therefore, what thoſe opinions were of the *one*, that were cenſured by the *other*, we ſhall, as far as our preſent argument is concerned, learn the ſentiments of *both*.

The ſubſtance of the Declaration of the opinions of the Petitioners, then, is this: "That God's holy predeſtination is not the *cauſe of ſin*:... That God doth *foreknow*, and *predeſtinate*, all good and goodneſs; but doth only *foreknow*, and *not predeſtinate* any evil, wickedneſs, or ſin.... For this cauſe," they ſay, "they are eſteemed of their Brethren, the Proteſtants, fautors of falſe religion, and conſtrained to ſuſtain at their hands the ſhameful reproach and infamy of Freewillmen, Pelagians, Papiſts, Epicures, Anabaptiſts, and enemies to God's holy predeſtination and providence;" and threatened with ſuch puniſhments as were denounced againſt theſe errors and ſects. "Whereas," they affirm, "they hold no ſuch thing as they are burdened withal; but do only hold concerning predeſtination as is above briefly declared." They beg therefore, "it may be provided, that none of thoſe puniſhments, which the Clergy have authority to exerciſe upon any of the aforeſaid errors and ſects, ſhall extend to be executed upon any manner of perſons as do hold of predeſtination as is above declared; except it be duly proved, that the ſame perſons do by their expreſs words or writings, affirm and maintain, *that man, of his own natural power, is able to think, will, or work, of himſelf, any thing that*

(n) Annals, p. 293—295.

ſhould, in any caſe, help, or ſerve toward his own ſalvation, or any part thereof; or elſe ſome other *manifeſt* Articles, or points of error, which any of the aforeſaid ſects, or any other, do hold [o]."

Theſe then were the principles of the *Diſſentients*, in accommodation to whom, Mr. Strype believes, the Article is ſilent about abſolute Reprobation. And is it not therefore in vain to argue with thoſe who deny the *Calviniſm* of the reſt, who conſtituted the main Body? What now becomes of the conceit ſo much inſiſted upon, that it was *only Pelagianiſm* which our Reformers diſliked and condemned? Is this Pelagianiſm, that aſcribes all good and goodneſs to God's holy predeſtination? Is it only Semipelagianiſm; is it Arminianiſm, which denies "that man, of his own natural power, is able to think, will, or work, any thing, that can, in any caſe, help, or ſerve, towards his own ſalvation, or any part thereof?" Or rather, would not theſe ſentiments of the more moderate party now be called *Calviniſtic?*——But how oppoſite, how diametrically oppoſite, is this whole repreſentation to that of our opponents, who contend that the *main body* of our Reformers were a kind of Arminian "Freewillmen," and that they accommodated the Article to a few diſſenting Calviniſts!

3. The next argument I will briefly notice, to prove that the private ſentiments of our Reformers were Calviniſtic, ſhall be,——The CONCESSIONS AND REASONINGS OF AVOWED ARMINIANS.

We have already ſeen what, among others, Biſhop Burnet has conceded. But his conceſſion is ſo remarkably important and deciſive on the ſubject, that it well merits a repetition. Biſhop Burnet then, let it be obſerved, was himſelf, confeſſedly, an *Arminian* [p]. The avowed object of his Expoſition of the Articles was, to prove them *not Calviniſtic;*

(o) Ibid. See the Petition.

(p) See Preface to Expoſition of Articles, p. 6.

or at leaſt, to quiet the miſgiving conſciences of ſubſcribing Arminians, and to wipe away the reproach, even then prevalent, "that our Articles looked one way, and our Doctors, for the moſt part, went the other [q]."—He was inſtigated to this work by Queen Mary; and the great Arch-Biſhop Tillotſon [r], an *Arminian*; and was, doubtleſs, therefore, conſidered, at leaſt, as well qualified for it, as any Divine in the Nation. It is moſt certain then that Biſhop Burnet would admit nothing on the other ſide of the queſtion, but what he was conſtrained to do by the force of the moſt manifeſt truth. Yet, as was ſhown above, has he, in this very work, moſt expreſsly aſſerted the whole matter for which we are contending; namely, that "In England, the FIRST REFORMERS were GENERALLY in the SUBLAPSARIAN Hypotheſis:" but that "Perkins and others aſſerted the Supralapſarian way;" which, he ſays, the foreign Reformers "*generally* followed [s]."—Can there then remain a ſhadow of doubt but that this was really the fact?

Hear however the ſame truth from the mouth of another Witneſs, equally free from ſuſpicion. No man, it is well known, ever diſcovered a more virulent hatred for every Calviniſtic doctrine, or a more fervent zeal to free our Church from the imputation of holding any ſuch Doctrine, than Dr. Heylin has done. No Man's Works on the ſubject are perhaps ſo frequently reſorted to by modern Writers of the ſame ſentiments [t]. Yet he too has been compelled to admit the truth of our preſent poſition again, and again. "It cannot be denied," ſays this zealous Arminian, "but that, by the error of theſe times, the reputation which Calvin had attained to in both Univerſities, and the extreme diligence of his followers, . . . there was a GENERAL TENDENCY

(q) See his Remarks on the Examination of his Expoſition of the 2d Article; and Preface to Expoſition. (r) Ibid. ſee. (s) Expoſition of Articles, p. 151. (t) See Dr. Hey's Nor. Lect Vol. ii. p. 208; Mr. Daubeny's Appendix, p. 210; &c.

unto his opinions; . . . his Book of Inſtitutes being for the moſt part the foundation on which the young Divines of thoſe times did build their ſtudies [v]."—What follows is ſurely important. "Of any men," ſaith he, "who publicly oppoſed the Calvinian tenets in this Univerſity [o] till after the beginning of King James' reign, I muſt confeſs that I have hitherto found no good aſſurance [w]." Nor can he, after the moſt diligent ſearch, name more than TWO Divines, Buckridge, Tutor to Arch-biſhop Laud; and Houſon, who, he informs us, was afterwards ſuſpended; that *ſecretly* propagated other principles. The ſituation of theſe two Gentlemen Dr. H. compares to that of the Prophet Elijah, when he complained that he was left alone to oppoſe the whole world of Idolaters; but *ſuppoſes* however, that as in that caſe God had a ſecret reſervation of true Worſhippers, who had not bowed the knee to Baal, ſo here "there *might* be" many other ſecret Devotees to Arminianiſm [x].

The only difficulty reſulting from all this is, whether the Confeſſion, the Simile, or the Suppoſition, the unanſwerable MIGHT BE more than theſe two, moſt fully eſtabliſhes our poſition.

Again: In the reign of King Charles, more than ſixty years after the final ſettling of the Articles, when a ſuppreſſion of the Calviniſtic Doctrines was meditated by Arch-biſhop Laud, and the Royal Proclamation was procured; Such Dr. H. informs, was the *general attachment* of the Biſhops and Clergy to theſe doctrines, that the Arminian Party durſt not "venture the determining of thoſe points to a Convocation [y]."——"Since the *reſettling of the Church under Queen Elizabeth*," to the period above treated of; he ſays again, "the maintainers of the Anti-Calvinian doctrines, are but few in number, and make but a very *thin* appearance;" that "Apparent rari nantes in Gurgite vaſto [z]."

(v) Quinq. Hiſt. Works, p. 626. (o) Oxford. (w) Quinq. Hiſt. Works, p. 626. (x) Ibid. (y) Life of Archb. Laud, p. 147. (z) Quinq. Hiſt. p. 627.

—Thin indeed! *Four* or *five* during *half a Century*, in two Univerſities, and the whole Aggregate of Divines in the Nation! And theſe ſcarcely daring, or not ſuffered, to ſhow their heads; *three* out of the number being actually puniſhed for propagating their opinions [a]!—And what an argument does all this afford, when, as in the preſent inquiry, not what was the *truth*, but what was the PREVAILING SENTIMENT, is the queſtion.

This deciſive evidence againſt them has not however yet cauſed men of the ſame principles to abandon their cauſe. Still Mr. Daubeny will have it that Calviniſm was "not entertained by many Learned men of the Univerſity of Cambridge, till the year 1595 [b]." Heylin then muſt have been very unſucceſsful in ſearching for them.—"The preaching of" the expelled "Baroe," and the diſcreet "Harſnet," is adduced alſo by Mr. Gray, as an argument that the ſpread of Calvinian ſentiments was but "partial" in Elizabeth's reign [c]. He ſays indeed, "and others;" but had he proceeded to their names, his ſituation would doubtleſs have reſembled Heylin's, and he might have confeſſed he could only find *another* [d].

But modern Arminians are far more ſparing in their con-

(a) Baroe, Barret, and Harſnet, at Cambridge; and the above-mentioned Buckridge and Houſon, at Oxford. Baro and Barret were driven, at leaſt choſe to retire from their ſituations in the Univerſity, in conſequence of the diſturbance their opinions occaſioned. Houſon was ſuſpended, and the other only ſaved themſelves by their ſilence and diſcretion. See Quinq. Hiſt. as above; Strype's Life of Whitgift, p. 476; Fuller's Hiſt. of Camb. p. 152; and Tindal's Continuation, Vol. iii. p. 280. (b) Appendix, p. 231. (c) Bamp. Lect. p. 267. N.—Mr. G.'s other arguments to prove this fact are the following: "1. The public profeſſions of faith. 2. The delay in the Upper Houſe of Convocation in ratifying Nowel's Catechiſm. 3. The ſuppreſſion of the Lambeth Articles." To the 1ſt a Calviniſt may anſwer, that it begs the queſtion: To the 2d, That they *did* ratify it: and to the *other*, That it was only, to ſay the moſt, the higheſt ſpecies of Calviniſm that they did not think neceſſary to be made eſſential to Church Communion. (d) Barret.

ceſſions, than their predeceſſors were. The oppoſite doctrines are become more a dead letter, and leſs intruſive; and their claims are denied as they appear without friends to ſupport them. Important conceſſions are however ſtill made on the ſubject. Thus the preſent writer admits, that "Calvinian ſentiments ſpread conſiderably among the Clergy in the reign of Elizabeth;" "that many perſons" in "eccleſiaſtical departments were ſtrongly tinctured with them;" that they "were induſtriouſly propagated and patronized by many eminent men; as by Cecil, Leiceſter, Walſingham, Sir Francis Knollis, &c.;" and that they were "liſtened to readily by many of our eſtabliſhment [e]."—So alſo the modern Prelate before noticed, when, ſpeaking of the preciſe time when our Articles were impoſed, and avowedly wiſhing to ſhow that Calviniſm was not eſtabliſhed in them, admits, "That *many* and thoſe of *great name*, were at that period, adherents to this doctrine [f]."

But the prevalence of theſe ſentiments may, it ſeems, be *eaſily accounted* for; and the whole body of Arminian Writers engage in aſſigning the reaſons of it [g]. But does this overthrow, or eſtabliſh, the fact? Admit that theſe ſentiments are of foreign extraction: So it may be ſhown are the general ſentiments of the Reformation here. Admit that ſome of the great characters employed in reſettling the Church on the Acceſſion of Elizabeth, had acquired a greater reliſh for them than they had before: Still theſe characters muſt be claſſed among our *principal Reformers*; ſtill *this* was the *period* when the doctrines were legally eſtabliſhed which are binding upon us. The more clearly therefore this circumſtance is *accounted for* by the Gentlemen in queſtion, the more clearly do they eſtabliſh the fact, they wiſh to refute.

(e) Bamp. Lect. p. 266, 267. (f) Preface to Nowel's Cat. p. 6. (g) See Heylin, Quinq. Hiſt. p. 594, 609; Ridley's 3d Lett. p. 35; Gray's Lect. p. 265, 266; Hey's Nor. Lect. Vol. ii. p. 209; Daubeny's Appendix, p. 230.

They would insinuate indeed, that at some *previous* period of the Reformation, *other* (their own) sentiments obtained. Now admitting this also, it does not much concern us. They produce however no *proper* evidence that this was the case after any thing was *regularly and legally done*. We shall say no more here respecting the Works of Henry the Eighth's time, of which so much use is made for this purpose. From these Writings, it has already appeared [h], they may equally prove, that our church holds many of the distinguishing peculiarities of Popery; and their very recurrence to such illegitimate testimony affords no mean evidence of their lack of better, and that their case is a forlorn one.

More hopeless however, if possible, is the attempt to prove that it was only at some still *later* period when these Calvinistic sentiments so prevalently obtained. Heylin himself represents the circumstance as *coeval* with our legal establishment, with "*the resettling of the Church* under Queen Elizabeth[i]." And the testimony of Hume, Mosheim, Bishop Burnet, and the whole body of other evidence we have adduced, respects the "Church of England from her FIRST *restoration from Popery*," our "FIRST *Reformers*," "the FIRST *English Reformers*," "the FIRST *Reformers* in England [k]." Yes, Mr. Daubeny! The "particular period" in which you and your colleagues allow these doctrines were prevalent, includes the VERY PERIOD when our Articles were made what they now are, and legally imposed, as well as a whole century afterwards: "The LARGE PORTION of the great body of the Clergy of our church [l]," you speak of, as favouring such sentiments, includes the VERY MEN who thus formed and imposed these Articles.

It may be added to the same effect, that nearly the whole of what is produced in opposition to our argument, from the Works of these times, respects only the proper *manner* of

---

(h) Above, p. 58. (i) Above, p. 82. (k) Above, p. 70—72. (l) Appendix, p. 198.

treating on the ſubject of Predeſtination and Election, and the *abuſe* of the doctrine, and is what every ſenſible modern Calviniſt moſt cordially approves.

I will take as an inſtance of this, the paſſage quoted by ſo many Arminian Writers, and among others, by Mr. Gray, from "Biſhop Hooper's Introduction to his Expoſition of the Decalogue." None of the illuſtrious Prelates who ſuffered Martyrdom for their principles, uſed language more favourable to the ſcheme of the Arminians, than Biſhop Hooper; and no where, it may ſeem, from the frequent uſe they make of this paſſage, has he ſaid what more favours it than here. Let us then examine the paſſage fairly, and allow it all its weight. As quoted by Mr. Gray it runs thus: "It is not a Chriſtian man's part to ſay that God hath written fatal laws, as the Stoic, and with neceſſity of deſtiny violently pulleth one by the hair into heaven, and thruſteth the other headlong into hell. The cauſe of rejection or damnation, is ſin in man, which will not hear, neither receive, the promiſe of the goſpel[m]." This Mr. Gray produces as a "remarkable paſſage;" remarkable, we muſt underſtand him, for its complete deciſion againſt Calviniſm. This idea of it is alſo ſupported by the Conductors of the Britiſh Critic, who both approve of Mr. G's uſe of it, and themſelves deſcribe it, as "expreſsly combating the notion of abſolute decrees[n]."

We cannot however, at all, judge of Biſhop Hooper's meaning in theſe words, unleſs we attend alſo to the other parts of the paſſage with which they are immediately connected. Leſs mutilated the paſſage ſtands thus:—"It is not a Chriſtian's part to attribute his ſalvation to his *own* FREE WILL with the Pelagian, AND EXTENUATE *original ſin;* nor to make God the Author of Evil or our Damnation, with the Manichee: Nor yet to ſay, God hath wrote fatal laws, as the Stoics, and with neceſſity of deſtiny vio-

(m) Bamp. Lect. p. 246. N. (n) For Auguſt, 1795.

lently pulleth one by the hair into heaven, and thrusteth the other headlong into hell. But ascertain thyself by scripture what be the *causes* of reprobation, and what of election. The cause of rejection or damnation is sin in man, who will not hear nor receive the promise of the gospel. . . . The *cause* of our election is the *mercy of God in Christ*. Howbeit, he that will be partaker of this Election, must receive the promise in Christ by faith. For *therefore* we be elected, because AFTERWARD we are made the members of Christ, &c." So we judge of Election by the event or success which happeneth in the life of man [p]."

And is it not now a little extraordinary, that this very paragraph, when taken as it is, should be *remarkably* decisive against some Arminian Tenets, which Mr. Gray and his Brethren in sentiment, ascribe to our church? Yet certainly it is so. Mr. Gray "rejects" the doctrine "of Predestination," as a "curious conceit [q]:" Bishop Hooper *establishes* it, by teaching us rightly to ascertain the *causes*, the *consequences*, and the *evidences*, of reprobation and election. With Mr. Gray, it is "incautious and excessive enthusiasm, to dilate on *gratuitous justification*, so as to invalidate the *important doctrine of* FREEWILL [r]:" Bishop Hooper represents the making our *salvation to turn upon our freewill*, as *extenuating* original sin, and no better than *pelagianism*. Mr. Gray says, "Our church considers . . . election as importing a *foreseen conformity* to the Divine will [s]:" Bishop Hooper says, "The *cause* of our Election is the *mercy of God in Christ*, and that *therefore* we are elected," not because we are *seen* to be good, but, that we may be *made* so; "because *afterwards* we are made members of Christ, &c."

This last clause contains, in effect, the whole matter at issue; namely, whether faith, holiness, &c. are the *fruits* of election, or the *cause* of it; and so far we see, are the An-

(p) See Strype's Eccles. Mem. Vol. ii. p. 203, or the Work itself.
(q) Bamp. Lect. p. 246. N. (r) Ibid. p. 266. (s) Ibid. p. 246.

cient Martyr and the Modern Divine from harmonizing on the ſubject, that they view it in directly oppoſite lights. The *one* ſays, "The *cauſe* of our election is the *mercy of God in Chriſt*; the *other* teaches, that election imports a "*foreſeen conformity* to the Divine Will."

But what do the good Biſhop's words contain that is ſo irreconcileable with the Calviniſtic ſcheme? He forbids us to talk of fate like the MANICHEANS or STOICS: So do the Calviniſts. They do not with the former of theſe Sects hold that there is an *Independent Evil Principle*, to which they ſo attribute evil as to exculpate themſelves[t]: They do not, with the latter of them, aſcribe what happens in human affairs to an *immutable deſtiny*, reſulting from the influence of matter, or from no man knows what, by which God himſelf is reſtrained[v]; but, to the appointment of a Supreme

---

(t) See Milner's Hiſtory of the Church, Vol. ii. p. 340—386; where both their ſentiments, and the light in which St. Auſtin viewed them after his converſion, are mentioned; Moſheim, Vol. i. p. 240; Beauſobre; Cave; &c.

(v) It is unneceſſary here, were it poſſible, to ſay preciſely, amidſt the variety of ſtrange and inconſiſtent notions of this ſect, what they meant either by *God* or *Fate*. This ſeems to have been the *popular* idea. And thoſe perſons who have extolled the language of the wiſer part of them on our ſubject, appear to have put a better conſtruction upon their Words, than they were capable of doing themſelves.—Dr. Moſheim's account of them is, that they conſider "God a corporeal Being, united to matter by a neceſſary connection, and ſubject to the determinations of an immutable fate."—St. Auſtin ſays, "Dicunt omnia ſidera partes Jovis eſſe, et omnia vivere et rationales animas habere, et ideo ſine controverſia Deos eſſe."—Lactantius adds, "Iſti uno naturæ nomine res diverſiſſimas comprehenderunt; Deum et Mundum, Artificem et opus, dicuntq: Alterum ſine altero nihil poſſe, tanquam natura ſit Deus Mundo permiſtus."—And Laertius, ſpeaking of Chryſippus, one of the patriarchs and champions of the ſtoical ſect, ſays, "Puriſſimum dixit, ac Liquidiſſimum Æthera, quem etiam primum aſſerunt Stoici eſſe Deum, ſenſibiliter veluti infuſum, per ea quæ ſunt in

Governor of infinite Wiſdom, Power, Goodneſs, and Perfection, who, they believe, orders all things with a view to his *own glory*, and the *greateſt poſſible ultimate good of his creatures*[w]. He denies, that in conſequence of ſuch a deſtiny, ſome are violently thruſt headlong on the road to ſalvation, and others to perdition, without the *concurrence* of their own wills: So do the Sublapſarians. The *one*, they believe, God only *ſuffers*, to follow their *own will*, and their *own way*, and that this terminates in their ruin; and that the *other* he diſpoſes to *approve, chooſe*, and *love*, that which is good, by a ſupply of proper means, and the influences of his Grace[x]. He teaches, that the *cauſe* of God's rejection of any man is his *ſin*, and rejection of the goſpel: So do thoſe who are called Calviniſts[y]. He inculcates the *ab-*

---

aere, per cunctas Animantes et Arbores, per terram autem ipſam fœcundum Halitum."—Even the famous prayer of Cleanthes, on which ſo great ſtreſs is laid in vindicating their notions, clearly repreſents *Fate* as a *Semi-Deity*, and *Coequal Partner* with Jupiter in the arrangement of human affairs. It runs thus:

Αγε δη με, ω Ζευ, καὶ συ, ἡ Πεπρωμενη,
Ὁποι ποθ' ὑμιν ειμι διατεταγμενος,
Ως ἑψομαι σπουδαιος ηδε αοκνος.
Εαν δε μη εθελω, ουκ ἡττον ἑψομαι.

It is therefore ſurely no proof that a man is an Arminian, becauſe he does not talk of God and of Fate like the Stoics.—See Moſheim's Hiſt. Vol. i. p. 28; Auſtin De Civit. Dei Lib. 7. cap. 2.; Diogenes Laertius de vitis Philos., eſpecially that of Zeno, the founder of the Stoic Sect; Epictetus Enchir. Cap. 77; Cicero de natura Deorum, de Fato; &c. &c.

(w) See a ſummary of Leibnitz's Scheme apud Dr. Maclaine, Moſheim's Hiſt. Vol. v. p. 24; Dr. Bellamy on the Wiſdom of God in the permiſſion of Sin, and the Millenium; Dr. Blair's Sermon on Pſalm lxxvi. 10; &c. &c.

(x) See Edward's on the Will; and the Writings of Davenant, Hall, Doddridge, Scott, &c. paſſim. (y) See ibid.

ſolute neceſſity of faith and holineſs; and that theſe are the only *certain evidences* by which we muſt judge of our election: So do all ſenſible Calviniſts [z].

The whole therefore that this famous paſſage can fairly be made to inculcate, is, the propriety of guarding againſt the *exceſſes* and *abuſes* of the Doctrines of Predeſtination and Election; and the *proper manner* of treating on the ſubject; namely, that we muſt argue from the effect to the cauſe, and only infer our election from our Chriſtian experience and conduct.

And this is nothing but what was generally taught by our leading Divines of this period. "If," ſays the excellent Biſhop Hall, "we conſider of *God's working* and proceeding with us, the *order is the reverſe*, as it is alſo rightly ſtated in the 17th Article; but, if we conſider *the order of our apprehending* the ſtate wherein we ſtand with God, we muſt ASCEND ONLY from our effectual calling, and true believing, to a comfortable aſſurance of our election [a]."—"No otherwiſe," adds Biſhop Carleton, "would God have us to be certain," of this circumſtance, "but a *poſteriori*, from the effects of his ſpirit we apprehend in our own ſouls [b]." This alſo is the purport of the famous reaſoning "*aſcendendo*", maintained to be the true doctrine of predeſtination by Biſhop Bancroft [c]. And preciſely the ſame might be ſhown, of *all* that is ſo generally quoted by writers of an Arminian caſt, from the works of Melancthon [z], Latimer [y], Hall [x],

(z) See ibid.; Archbiſhop Uſher's Body of Divinity, p. 92; and Arch-biſhop Leighton on 1 Peter. vii. 8. (a) Remains, Sermon on 2 Peter, i. 10. p. 269. (b) Exam. of Montague, p. 142. (c) Summe of the Hampton Court Conference, p. 29. (z) The famous quotation from this celebrated Reformer on the ſubject is, the following remark he made to Arch-biſhop Cranmer: "Nimis horridæ fuerunt initio ſtoicæ diſputationes apud noſtros (the foreign Reformers) de fato, et diſciplinæ nocuerunt." See Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 409. It is remarkable, however, that at the ſame time, and alſo on other occaſions, he recommended to the

the Reformatio Legum[w], and the laſt clauſe of the 17th Article. The paſſages contain nothing more than ſome *ſalutary cautions* againſt the *abuſes* or *miſrepreſentation* of the Calviniſtic Doctrines, of which cautions every prudent Calviniſt fully admits the propriety.

4. On all hands therefore does it thus unqueſtionably appear, how generally thoſe ſentiments were entertained by the FOUNDERS OF OUR CHURCH, which are *now* repreſented as "a curious conceit[d]," "a ſyſtem of nonſenſe[e]," "an artifice of the Devil[f];" "a doctrine, which carries its own condemnation upon the face of it[g]," is ſynonimous with "fanaticiſm[h]," "makes God a Tyrant[i]," "lays the ax at once to the root of all religion[k]," "is full of barbarity and blaſphemy[l]:" and, ſtrange to ſay, thus repreſented too, by thoſe who fill high ſtations in this Church, by thoſe who PROFESS TO ADHERE TO THE GENUINE DOCTRINES OF HER REFORMERS!

Arch-biſhop, "that nothing might be left under *general terms*, but expreſsed with all the perſpicuity and diſtinctneſs imaginable." Ibid. So directly hoſtile was this Divine to that *general latitude of expreſſion* and interpretation, he is ſo often cited to favour. Melancthon, Bp. Davenant ſays, only diſapproved of the *manner* in which ſome delivered the doctrine of Predeſtination, &c. Anſwer to Hoord, p. 72. See alſo Clarke's Marrow of Hiſt. p. 293. (y) See Quinq. Hiſt. p. 556, and Latimer's Sermons, paſſim. (x) See Anſ. to the Confeſſional, Lett. 3. p. 70, from Bp. H's Shaking of the olive tree, p. 355, &c. (w) Vide Caput. 22. De Hæres. Ibid. Cap. 9. (d) Mr. Gray's Bamp. Lect. p. 246. n. (e) Daubeny's Appendix, p. 229., from Dr. Balguy. (f) Ibid. p. 303. (g) Daubeny's Guide, p. 77. (h) Mr. Polwhele's 2d Letter to Dr. Hawker, p. 18. n. (i) Dr. Hey's Nor. Lect. Vol. 3. p. 497, from Dr. Balguy. See alſo Mr. Daubeny's Appendix, p. 149, and quotation from Jortin. (k) Dr. Paley's Viſitation Sermon, 1777, p. 15. (l) Mr. Polwhele's 1ſt Letter, p. 43. n. See alſo Biſhop Watſon's Charge, 1795, p. 67, 68.

There is, however, it must be confessed, a discovery made by Mr. Daubeny, which, if it be just, forms a considerable objection to our conclusion. "But Sir," says this Writer to his Opponent, "I shall not do justice to the 17th Article, if I do not observe further, that so far from being intended to favour the *Calvinistic Doctrine*, it appears to me, to furnish the MOST DECISIVE INTERNAL EVIDENCE AGAINST IT[m]!" Poor deluded Historians, ancient and modern, foreign and domestic, who, with one voice, have told us, that our public Confessions are formed on the *Augustinian*, or *Calvinian* plan[n]! Poor unfortunate Bishop Burnet, who, when employed by his Queen, and the great Metropolitan, for the very opposite purpose, has said, "It is not to be denied, but that the Article seems to be framed according to St. Austin's doctrine;" that although, in his judgment, *others* might subscribe it, yet that "the *Calvinists have less occasion for scruple*, since the *Article does seem more plainly to favour them*;" and that the very "Cautions that are added to it, do likewise intimate that *St. Austin's doctrine* was *designed* to be settled by the Article[o]! Poor good-natured Arminians, who have made so many undue *Concessions*, and have *so laboured to account* for this circumstance; ascribing it to the Marian Exile, and a desire to comprehend the Calvinists, and to the fact, that "some of the compilers of the

(m) Appendix, p. 221. (n) Above, p. 70, 74. (o) Expo. of Arts. p. 168. See also above. p. 70. Yet Mr. Polewhele who makes high claims to liberality of sentiment, and consistency of conduct; who is most indignant at being thought in any degree to have deviated from the Articles; and who says "I subscribed them, with Burnet in my hands; and Burnet has, from that hour, been my guide[y];" says, with nearly the same breath, "I abhor the Calvinists[z]!"

(y) 2d Letter to Dr. Hawker, (z) Ibid. p. 16, Note. See also 3 Letters passim.

Articles were Calviniſts[p]!" Poor ſhort-ſighted ſimpletons, all together, who, for *two hundred and thirty-ſeven years*, have been doting about the *Calviniſtic tendency* of our Articles, when, after all, the *very Article upon which this opinion has been chiefly founded, furniſhes the* MOST DECISIVE EVIDENCE AGAINST IT! Well may Mr. Daubeny be repreſented as "indiſputably the *very foremoſt*, or *among the foremoſt*, Writers of the Age[q]!" Well may it be triumphantly concluded, that "Calviniſts will hardly attempt to *reaſon* with him[r]!" With the man, who can view ſuch an Article in ſuch a light, conſidered under all its circumſtances, and in connection with what has been the prevailing opinion of perſons of all perſuaſions upon it, it is certainly in vain to reaſon.

5. Nothing, however, is further from our purpoſe, than to infer, from what has been advanced in this Section, that the preciſe theological ſyſtem of *John Calvin*, in *all its parts*, and to *its full extent*, was intended to be eſtabliſhed in the 39 Articles, to the excluſion of every milder ſentiment. We think they have equally failed who have attempted to ſhow this, whether the exaltation, or degradation, of the national confeſſion, has been their object. To ſay the leaſt, our eſtabliſhed forms do not *teach directly* ſeveral doctrines which are contained in Calvin's Inſtitutions. They do not, with this work, affirm that the *Fall*

(p) The Anti-jacobin Reviewers aſſign this laſt-mentioned reaſon, Jan. 1800, p. 47. See alſo above, p. 69, 73. The Monthly Reviewers noticing 'Obſervations on that part of the Bp. of Lincoln's Elements, which reſpects the 17th Article, By an Old Chriſtian,' ſay, "We *muſt own* that this Old Chriſtian appears to us to have ſo far proved his point, that he has ſhown that no other doctrine than that of pure *Calviniſm* is to be found in the Article in queſtion[z]." (q) Antij. Rev. for Nov. 1799. p. 255. (r) Ibid. p. 359.

(z) Oct. 1800. p. 161.

of Adam was the effect of a *Divine Decree*[s]: They do not uſe the language it does, reſpecting the *extent of Chriſt's Redemption*[t]: They are ſilent concerning *abſolute reprobation*[v], which is here taught expreſsly[w]. The Authors of theſe forms unqueſtionably built upon *the ſame foundation*, with this celebrated Reformer, but they have not carried the *ſuperſtructure* to *the ſame height*. They were aware of *the extremes* to which ſome had proceeded on theſe ſubjects, and of the liability of the doctrines of grace to abuſe; and wiſhed therefore to expreſs themſelves with moderation and caution[x]. They were aware of the inability of the human underſtanding to comprehend the *whole* of the Divine plan of procedure towards his creatures; and of courſe, of the difficulties attending the ſubject, when purſued beyond a certain limit. They wiſhed, therefore, in framing a ſtanding public Confeſſion, to decide no further upon theſe deep points than they believed the deciſion of importance, and for which they had the moſt expreſs and certain warrant of Scripture. They knew that on this ſubject eſpecially

> "Eſt modus in rebus, ſunt certi denique fines,
> "Quos ultra, citraque nequit conſiſtere rectum."

(s) Inſt. Lib. 3. Cap. 23. § 8. p. 335. (t) Compare particularly the Explanation of the Creed in the Catechiſm; the Conſecration Prayer in the Communion Service; and the writings of Cranmer, Latimer, and Hooper, every where; with Inſtit. Lib. 3. (v) See 17th Art.; Clement's Confeſſion; and the Articles ſubſcribed in the 1ſt year of Elizabeth. (w) Inſtit. Lib. Cap. 23. §. 8; Ibid. §. 1; and Calvin, in Rom. ix. 18. (x) They ſay this expreſsly in the Articles ſubſcribed as above, but declare at the ſame time, that "ſeeing ſome men of late have riſen, which do gainſay and impugn this *truth* (Predeſtination) we cannot paſs over this matter with ſilence, both for that the Holy Ghoſt doth ſo often make mention of it in the Scriptures, which argueth it to be a thing both fruitful and profitable to be known; and alſo being occaſioned by the ſame reaſon which moved St. Auſtin to write of this matter of Predeſtination." Strype's Annals, p. 118. This ſhows us that guarding againſt the *abuſe* of the doctrine, is not denying the doctrine.

Or, to adopt the more lofty language of inſpiration: They knew in reſpect to the Divine Procedure in theſe inſtances, "That clouds and darkneſs are round about him, but that righteouſneſs and judgment are the habitation of his throne." They wiſhed unequivocally to teach, that man's *ſalvation* is *wholly of grace*, but that his *perdition* is of *himſelf*; and neither to make *God the author of ſin*, nor *man a mere machine*, and unfit to be treated as a *moral agent*. All beyond this, they have left to be reſolved on the principle of human ignorance. And, whatever may be ſaid to the contrary, this is not in the ſmalleſt degree belying the principles we have aſcribed to them, and mutilating the ſubject, but diſcovering at once the greateſt piety and the greateſt wiſdom upon it[y].

Is it ſaid, that, in reality, there is no difference between this ſyſtem and the higher ſpecies of Calviniſm? It may be anſwered, however that be, the church is only reſponſible for the doctrines ſhe *teaches expreſsly*, and not for the *inferences and conſequences* which may be deduced from theſe doctrines by thoſe who perhaps do not underſtand them, and which ſhe probably may diſavow.

Theſe "moderate bounds," as the excellent Biſhop Hall obſerves, "the church of England, guided by the ſcriptures, has ſet on this ſubject[z]." But ſo far ſhe has certainly decided. The doctrines now often termed *moderate Calviniſm*, ſhe unequivocally inculcates. Theſe correſponded with the *doctrines of Auſtin*[a] the great model of her founders. With theſe there is not a ſingle paſſage in any of her public Writings which does not harmonize. From theſe we are confident, no fair Interpreter can free her.

But, according to their own plain and full repreſentation[o]

(y) See below, Ch. 8. §. 2. (z) Via media, ſhaking of the Olive tree, p. 366. (a) See Dr. Hey's Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 200, 203; and Milner's Review of Auſtin's Theology, Hiſt. of the Church, Vol. ii. p. 501—510. (o) See above, p. 70.

ofthe matter, theſe moderate Doctrines, or the *notions of Auſtin* on this ſubject, come under the reprehenſion of our opponents. On the other hand, theſe are the doctrines maintained by the Divines I am vindicating. In which of their writings can our opponents find a ſingle paragraph that goes *beyond* the Sublapſarian Scheme? But much may be found that comes *below* it. There is nothing about the Divine Decree of the Fall, Reprobation, or any other of the doctrines, which are properly denominated the *rigors* of the Calviniſtic ſyſtem inſiſted upon in their works. Even "the hoary Baronet[b]," who has ſo recently been called a "rigid Calviniſt and Predeſtinarian[c]," begs leave with Auſtin, to differ from ſome great primitive authorities of our church, on the ſide of *moderation*[q]: And how muſt every *Divine* ſmile to ſee theſe epithets applied, at the ſame time, to another diſtinguiſhed Senator[d]. The moſt doctrinal writer, in the claſs under conſideration, Mr. Hervey, ſpeaks thus reſpecting theſe deep points: "Predeſtination and Reprobation, I think of with fear and trembling. And if I ſhould attempt to ſtudy them, I would ſtudy them on my knees[e]."

When therefore, certain Writers have formed a frightful ſyſtem of nothing but abſolute Decrees, abſolute Reprobation, and other Extravagancies, which we diſavow, they may attack it as vehemently as they pleaſe; but it deſerves their conſideration, that it is a creature of their own, and that in reſpect to *us*, at leaſt, the moſt pointed of their weapons falls "Telum imbelle ſine ictu." Mr. Daubeny may deduce his conſequences, aſſume the prerogative of knowing men's hearts, and inſiſt upon it, in ſpite of themſelves, that they hold doctrines[f] which they *ſay, and believe, they do not*; but it deſerves his conſideration, that ſuch a procedure is abſurd in itſelf, that it is contrary to the eſta-

---

(b) Sir Richard Hill. (c) Antijac. Rev. Nov. 1799, p. 258. (q) Anſ. to Daubeny, p. 89, 90. (d) Mr. Wilberforce. (e) Collection of Letters, n. 93, p. 223. (f) Appendix, p. 222.

bliſhed laws of controverſy[g], and that it is juſt as fair, and juſt as ſignificant, as it would be to infer, from his ſtronger expreſſions reſpecting *human agency*, that at the bottom he muſt be a Socinian.

Here then we might well reſt our whole queſtion. The Church of England, we have ſeen ſtrong reaſon for concluding, is *moderately Calviniſtic*. The chief ſubjects of our Apology are profeſſedly ſo. This circumſtance therefore might at once decide who have *adhered* to, and who have *departed* from, the original and genuine doctrines of the Articles, as none but thoſe accuſed of *Methodiſm* even profeſs to hold any tenet that is *Calviniſtic*.

It will however abundantly ſuffice, to our preſent purpoſe, to proceed upon a ſtill broader baſis. Many ſincere Chriſtians, we believe, are prepared to join in the ſongs of heaven, in aſcribing their whole "Salvation to God and the Lamb," and hold the above doctrines *eſſentially*, who diſown the *name* we have affixed to them. With theſe perſons we would by no means quarrel, for the ſake of a *term* which we only adopt in the want of one to expreſs our ſentiments more perfectly. But, what is of more weight in the conſideration, it is not either the name or the nature of Calviniſm, as ſuch, to which our opponents confine their attack. It is the doctrine of *Salvation by Grace, through faith in the Redeemer*, under whatever *form* or *name* it is profeſſed, to which, in reality, they at the bottom object. Several of the late popular Works which have endured the direct attack, or the invidious ſneer, contain nothing that is peculiarly Calviniſtic. Other Writings and Sentiments which have experienced this treatment, are profeſſedly *Arminian*[h].

Whether therefore the Church of England has determined this way, or the other, or neither, on ſome of the abſtruſe points agitated between the Calviniſts and Arminians is not

(g) See Dr. Hey, Vol. i. p. 411. (h) See Mr. Clapham's Sermon; Dr. Croft's Thoughts; and Mr. Daubeny's Works.

our determining point: On this circumstance we do not found the truth of our main position: But *thus much* we must insist upon; *this* every Person, sufficiently acquainted with these subjects, will see it impossible not to allow us; that in proportion as *Calvinism prevailed when our Articles were established*, and *as the private sentiments of the Compilers, Revisers, and Imposers of these Articles were Calvinistic*, a strong argument is furnished, in *favour* of our interpretation of them, and in *opposition* to theirs whose ingenuity is employed in explaining them away.

We have now then taken a very comprehensive view of our subject; we have examined our different Forms of doctrine and worship, as they explain and illustrate each other; the Title which the Articles bear; and the Preamble which is annexed to them: We have further investigated, the Circumstances in which our reformers were placed, and the object they had in view;—their other authentic theological Writings;—the Authorities they respected;—and, their own private Sentiments; and from the whole, it appears most unquestionably,

That on the points of doctrine now under consideration, they meant at least to establish ALL THEY HAVE EXPRESSED; that on many occasions they WENT BEYOND what is necessarily implied in the letter of the Articles, and discovered sentiments still further from the divinity we oppose; but that they never, by any means, ABRIDGED or RESTRICTED the full and natural sense of their Words, and most certainly never *intended they should be so interpreted.*

And hence, it follows, as unquestionably, That all who in any degree EXTENUATE, or EVADE the plain, literal, and full meaning of these Articles, on the doctrines in question, do NOT "teach them as they were first delivered by our Reformers." But this, in a very notorious degree, it has appeared in a former chapter, is undeniably the conduct of

our Opponents. One part[l] of their position is therefore again overturned.

But hence also, on the other hand, it clearly follows, That they who teach according to this *plain, literal, and full meaning of the Articles,* DO TEACH them in their *true and primitive sense;* and that they who, to a certain extent, *exceed this literal meaning* on the side of *Divine Agency,* do not teach *more* than was taught by our Reformers.——And here we call upon our accusers to show, by fair quotation, from the Writings of Milner, Hawker, Scott, from the Practical Review, the Strictures on Education, the Scripture Characters, or Venn's complete Duty of Man, works they have particularly attacked, any doctrine that exceeds this standard; any thing that in its natural tendency, and by fair construction, *means more* than what is plainly taught in our Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy, and illustrated by the known sentiments, and the other writings of our Reformers. Until they do this, we must conclude that the *other part*[m] of their position is also groundless, and that it is equally certain that we *have,* as that they have *not,* adhered to the true and original doctrines of these forms.

(l) Se above, p. 12—15. (m) See Ibid.

CHAP. III.

An Examination whoſe teaching moſt reſembles that of our Church and her Reformers in reſpect to, the USE *made of the peculiar Doctrines of the Goſpel, and the neceſſity of* PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY.

IT is a fact of which it is impoſſible to doubt, that our Reformers did not teach the doctrines in queſtion, as mere ſpeculative and unintereſting opinions, which it is ſufficient barely to aſſent to, and contemplate at a diſtance; but as truths of the very higheſt importance, truths which it becomes every Chriſtian to know *practically*. They conſidered them of more worth than their exalted ſtations in the church; their moſt admired worldly poſſeſſions; their country; their liberty, or even their lives. Their own characters and behaviour, at once, convincingly ſhow on what doctrines they laid the greateſt ſtreſs; and how eſſential they believed the *practical knowledge* of their tenets. Their exertions in the propagation of theſe doctrines; their invincible conſtancy; patient reſignation; exalted charity; triumphant faith, under the moſt trying provocations, the heavieſt preſent ſacrifices, and in the midſt of the flames, afford a ſtriking proof both what the genuine efficacy of their principles is, and that it was experienced by themſelves. No where, ſave in the exhibitions of the Bible itſelf, can we ſee more that is truly Chriſtian, both of doctrine and practice, than in the dying ſentiments and behaviour of thoſe among them who ſealed the ſincerity of their profeſſion with their blood. They were unanimous, at this ſolemn ſeaſon, in excluding all merit from themſelves; in building all their

hopes of ſalvation upon the mercy of God in Chriſt Jeſus; in rejoicing that they were counted worthy to ſuffer for his ſake; and, in expreſſing a moſt firm and unſhaken confidence of poſſeſſing eternal life, through him[a]. And with preciſely the ſame views did thoſe depart, who ſurvived this ſtorm, and went from earth to heaven by a more ordinary way, in the ſucceeding reign[b].

It was not, in the judgment of theſe "divine men[c]," the part of "Ambaſſadors of Chriſt" to *omit*, and generally ſeem to *forget*, the peculiar doctrines of the goſpel, in their public diſcourſes, any more than to diſavow them. They did not barely ſtate, in general terms, the outlines of the Chriſtian ſyſtem; make little or no more uſe of it; and conſider it their chief buſineſs "to be the apes of Epictetus," Plato, or Seneca. The diſtinguiſhing tenets of Chriſtianity ever conſtituted the prominent features of their religious inſtructions, and are their reigning theme in the forms of doctrine and worſhip they provided. "The ſum of their doctrine," as we are aſſured from their own mouths, is, "to ſet forth Chriſt crucified to be the only Lord and Redeemer; giving all glory unto God, the only worker of our ſalvation, and removing all merit from man; and commending and teaching ſuch good works of all men diligently to be done, as God in his word has preſcribed[d]." Accordingly, every view of this gracious Redeemer's character is preſented; every part of his aſtoniſhing work is enumerated, in our creeds; while to his croſs and ſufferings there is a conſtant reference throughout the public ſervice. Every rite points to him for its efficacy; every petition is preſented in his name; every expectation is founded upon his merits; every endeavour is directed to his glory; every acceptable work

(a) See Fox, Strype, &c. paſſim. (b) See Strype's Lives of Parker, Jewel, &c. (c) Biſhop Hurd thus denominates the Reformers, Sermon 11. Vol. iii. p. 206. (d) See Articles ſubſcribed in the firſt year of Elizabeth, Strype's Annals p. 117.

is aſcribed to the power of his grace.——For proof of all this, we refer to our forms themſelves; to the private letters, confeſſions, and other theological works, of theſe venerable men; and to the relations of their moſt approved biographers.

Preſent notions, however, ſhall induce us to be a little more particular in ſhowing, that our Reformers held the abſolute neceſſity of ſomething more than a mere *form* of religion, even of what we denominate a perſonal, practical, and experimental acquaintance with the doctrines they taught.

Either then the church of England conſiders *all* perſons real Chriſtians who are comprehended within her external pale, or ſhe conſiders only *ſome* of her viſible members entitled to this character, and the reſt mere nominal and profeſſed Chriſtians.——In a *general* Form ſhe uſes *general* expreſſions. She aſſumes not the prerogative of knowing either men's hearts, or God's unrevealed appointments. Neceſſarily, therefore, not leſs than in the judgment of charity, on ſome occaſions, ſhe addreſſes *all* as true Chriſtians who *profeſs* to be ſuch. Every child that ſhe has baptized, ſhe ſpeaks of, as "regenerate," as a partaker of the privileges of the goſpel, and as, in ſome ſenſe, called to "a ſtate of ſalvation:" She puts the language of real Chriſtians into the mouths of all her worſhippers: She expreſſes a favourable hope of every perſon whom ſhe inters.—Are we then hence to conclude that our church knows of no diſtinction but that between *profeſſed* Chriſtians and *profeſſed* heathens, Jews, &c.; and that ſhe really conſiders *all* who are her nominal members, in ſuch a ſenſe in a ſtate of ſalvation, as that they will eſcape future puniſhment and obtain everlaſting happineſs *whatever be their characters?* Do all perſons "omit or miſrepreſent the doctrines of baptiſm[e]" who do not accede to

(e) See the Antijac. Rev. for April, 1799, p. 369.

this opinion? Is there no method of aſcribing a proper efficacy to this divine ordinance, and of fixing a proper value upon our other outward Chriſtian privileges, but this? Will our opponents, will any profeſſed friends of the eſtabliſhment, maintain this doctrine? This would be making a ſhort and eaſy way to heaven indeed. This would remove a conſtant ſource of the faithful Miniſter's anxieties at once, and enable him, under the worſt of appearances, to commit the ſalvation of his people to the infallibility of his church.

But ſurely our Reformers knew too much of the ſcriptures, had too great an averſion to popery, and too much good ſenſe and piety, to ſubſtitute the mere ſhadow for the ſubſtance, and maintain this abſurd and licentious ſyſtem. It is contrary to what our church teaches expreſsly. In conformity to the Confeſſions of all the reformed churches ſhe affirms in direct terms, that "In the viſible church the EVIL be EVER MINGLED with the GOOD," and that even ſometimes the *evil* have chief authority in the miniſtration of the Word and Sacraments[f]:" She ſuppoſes, accordingly, that "The wicked, and ſuch as be void of a lively faith," and who INNOWISE ARE PARTAKERS OF CHRIST," may viſibly partake of the Lord's Supper, and only "to their condemnation[g]:" She declares, without any exception on account of external church-membership, that "they that have done evil, ſhall go into everlaſting fire[h]."

On the other hand, the initiatory Rite of Baptiſm, inculcates the neceſſity "of an inward and ſpiritual grace," of a "death unto ſin and a new birth unto righteouſneſs," as well as "the outward and viſible ſign of ſprinkling with water;" and "repreſents to us our profeſſion which," it is ſaid, "is, to follow the example of our Saviour Chriſt, and to be made like unto him: that as he died, and roſe again for

(f) Article 26. (g) Article 29. (h) Athanaſian Creed.

us; so should we who are baptized, die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living."

The same doctrine is implied and enforced in her whole explanation of the nature of this covenant. The express object of the Ordinance of Confirmation is, to teach the necessity of this personal and practical Christianity. The catechumen here declares, that he will actually ratify the engagements made on his behalf at Baptism, and promises in the most solemn manner, by the grace of God, in his own person, evermore to endeavour faithfully to observe them. And, only on his doing this, and doubtless on the supposition of his sincerity, is he pronounced forgiven and regenerate. Accordingly, none are invited to our Communion but those who "truly repent; have a lively faith, and are stedfastly purposed to lead a new" and holy life.

The whole service of our Church, indeed, consisting of confession, petition, devotion, thanksgiving, and worship, evidently presumes this to be the character of all her true members, and is, when engaged in by those who are destitute of this personal sense and feeling of what they utter, the most consummate nonsense and hypocrisy. She considers it the universal characteristic and experience of those who "at length, by God's mercy, attain to everlasting felicity," that they "bewail their manifold sins and wickedness," acknowledge their just desert of punishment, and sue earnestly to God, through Christ, for mercy[i]; that they "be called according to God's purpose by his spirit working in due season;" that "they through grace obey the calling, be justified freely, made Sons of God by adoption, made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, and walk religiously in good works[k]." She teaches moreover that

(i) See especially the Communion Service, and Litany, and Burial Service. (k) Art. 17.

such persons "feel in themselves the working of the spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things[l]." She affirms, that "good works do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit[m];" and consequently, that all who are destitute of a *holy life*, are not, in her sense of the word, *true believers*. She says expressly, that "true Christian faith *no man hath*, who in the outward profession of his mouth, and in his outward receiving of the Sacraments, in coming to the Church, and in all other outward appearances, seemeth to be a Christian man, and yet in his living and deeds sheweth the contrary[n]." Yea, so far is she from supposing, that a participation in her outward ordinances will be effectual to the salvation of any in whom this "inward thing signified," and aimed at, in these ordinances is wanting, that this circumstance, she teaches, will encrease their condemnation[o]. And to this effect, Ridley, Latimer, Cranmer, Taylor, Jewel, and every one of her chief reformers speak expressly on other occasions. The two first mentioned of these Worthies, shall here be the mouth for the rest. "Sometimes," observes Bishop R. meeting the objections of the Romanists, "The name of the Church is taken for the whole multitude of them who profess the name of Christ, of which they are also named Christians. But as St. Paul saith of the Jews, Not every one is a Jew, that is a Jew outwardly, &c. Neither yet all that be of Israel are counted the seed: even so, not every one that is a Christian outwardly is a Christian indeed. For if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, the same is none of his. Therefore that Church which is his body, and of which

(l) Ibid. (m) See Art. 12, and below, Ch. vii. §: 2.
(n) Homily on Salvation. (o) Art. 29; Exhortation at the Communion; Hom. on Sacrament, on the Resurrection; &c.

Chriſt is at the head, ſtandeth only on living ſtones, and true Chriſtians, not only outwardly in name and title, but inwardly in heart and in truth[z]." "A Chriſtian," adds honeſt Latimer, "that is, one admitted into the Church by Baptiſm, *if he anſwers not his profeſſion*, but gives himſelf up to fleſhly luſts, is in reſpect of eternal life which is promiſed to Chriſtians, no more a Chriſtian than a Jew or a Turk; yea, I ſay, his condition ſhall be worſe at the laſt day[p]."

Moſt clearly therefore it is the judgment of our church, that as "he is not a Jew," ſo neither is he a Chriſtian, "*who is* only *one outwardly*;" and that as it "is not circumciſion," ſo neither is that baptiſm, "*which is* only *outward in the fleſh*;" but that "*he* only *is a Jew*," or a Chriſtian, indeed, "who is one *inwardly*, and circumciſion," or baptiſm, "is that of the *heart*, in the *ſpirit*, and not in the letter, whoſe praiſe is not of men, but of God[q]." She clearly diſtinguiſhes, between her *true members* and thoſe who have "the *form* of godlineſs, but deny the *power* of it[r]." She certainly conſiders none who have arrived at maturity, and are capable ſubjects, in ſuch a ſenſe Chriſtians, as that they will obtain happineſs and heaven, except thoſe who are influenced by Chriſtian prinples, and exhibit a Chriſtian conduct; who are penitents, believers, and habitual obſervers of God's Law. When therefore, in general terms, ſhe addreſſes her profeſſing members as real Chriſtians, it is clearly on the ſuppoſition that, where opportunity is afforded, they really comply with the engagements, and enjoy the *preſent* bleſſings of the baptiſmal covenant. While therefore ſhe laments

(z) Conference with Latimer in priſon. (p) Fox's Acts, &c. 1ſt Ed. p. 1317, Anſwer to Dr. Sherwood; and 2d. Ed. p. 1913, Anſwer to Sir Edward Baynton; the Conference in priſon, p. 1807; &c. (q) See Rom. ii. 28, 29. (r) See 2 Tim. ii. 5.

the want of "a godly discipline[s]," by which notorious sinners might be more openly distinguished; and while she cannot see men's hearts, and therefore decides not in respect to the state of individuals, in the most solemn manner, she exhorts all her visible members to judge themselves by the standard of God's word; forewarns them of the awful punishment that awaits the wicked and mere formalists, and assures such that their abused Christian privileges will aggravate this punishment[t].

2. And now, whatever all this accords with besides, it is notoriously the doctrine of those for whom we are apologizing. It is that which is avowed by themselves; it is that for which they are specifically condemned by their opponents. This constant, all-important, use of the Saviour; this necessity of a personal and practical acquaintance with his doctrines, in order to Salvation; this consequent distinction between real and merely nominal Christians, constitutes the most striking of their peculiarities, and, in the judgment of such Divines as Dr. Paley, Dr. Croft, Mr. Daubeny, and Mr. Polwhele, the very essence of ther guilt[v]. In these particulars, even more, it is conceived, than in the theoretic articles of their respective creeds, the difference between the two parties consists. In the system of the one, the Redeemer is the Sun, the grand source of light, life, motion, comfort and every thing that is beautiful and excellent; in that of the other, he has only the place of some inferior luminary. The one makes something real and internal, a certain state of heart and character, essential to real Christianity; the other, as will appear presently[o], treats all as real Christians who assume the Christian name, and comply with the external forms of our religion.

(s) Commination Service; See also Arch-bishop Secker's Instructions to Candidates for Holy Orders. (t) See Ibid; and Note o. above. (v) See below, §. 3. (o) Ibid.

They cannot conſiſtently diſown the latter ſyſtem, who ridicule the former.

We, however, certainly do thus dwell on the *peculiar doctrines of Chriſtianity*, in our adminiſtrations. And we think we have the beſt grounded reaſon for this conduct [w]. Yet, let it not be unjuſtly inſinuated that we exalt one part of the Chriſtian ſcheme to the deſtruction of another. They alone we ſtrenuously maintain, "rightly divide the Word of Truth [a]," who aſcribe their due importance to all its parts; and who "ſhun not to declare all the counſel of God [b]." The doctrines in queſtion are pregnant with duties both to God and man. Theſe duties are to be explained and enforced. But to conſtitute them Chriſtian morality, they muſt be enforced from Chriſtian motives. So that in the very act of inculcating the moral duties, the principles peculiar to Chriſtianity are our reigning ſubject; and we have the authority of the Apoſtle, not leſs than that of our church, for determining comparatively "to know nothing [d]" elſe, in the execution of our high commiſſion.

And thus alſo do we maintain the neceſſity of *practical Chriſtianity*. We neither "omit nor miſrepreſent," nor by any means depreciate, the true "doctrine of baptiſm." There is, we conceive, "much profit" attending it; and as the profeſſed Jews had, ſo more eſpecially the profeſſed Chriſtian hath, every way, many diſtinguiſhing advantages and privileges in reſpect to his ſalvation. But a ſimilar kind of reaſoning, it is underſtood, is applicable to this Divine Ordinance, with that which the Apoſtle uſes reſpecting circumciſion. "Circumciſion verily profitteth, if thou keep the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumciſion is made uncircumciſion [c]." And as "they

(w) See below Ch. 9. Concluſion.
(a) 2 Tim. ii. 15.
(b) Acts xx. 27.
(d) 1 Cor. ii. 2.
(c) See Romans ii. 25; and iii. 1, 2.

were not all Iſrael, who were of Iſrael[f];" as all were not Iſraelites in a ſpiritual and higher ſenſe, who were circumciſed and Iſraelites by deſcent and profeſſion, but they only who followed the ſteps of Abraham in believing and obeying; ſo neither can all thoſe be conſidered Chriſtians in a true and ſpiritual ſenſe, who are born in Chriſtian countries, and enjoy many valuable Chriſtian privileges, but they only who are in reality, what, in the language of our church, they profeſs to be, who in reality embrace Chriſtian doctrines, and lead a Chriſtian life.

Our Church, for inſtance, ſuppoſes, in ſtrict conformity with the ſcriptures, that all real Chriſtians are regenerate by God's Holy Spirit[g]: In proportion therefore as her adult members really poſſeſs the views, diſpoſitions, and conduct, which invariably characterize the regenerate children of God in ſcripture, they may conclude themſelves real Chriſtians.—Our Church ſuppoſes that all her ſincere members really conſider themſelves "miſerable offenders," that they "do not preſume to come unto God, truſting in their own righteouſneſs, but in his manifold and great mercies;" that they "have a lively faith in God's mercy, through Chriſt;" and that this faith neceſſarily produces obedience, and is incompatible with a courſe of allowed ſin[h]: In proportion therefore as the characters of her profeſſors correſpond with theſe circumſtances, they are her true members.—Our Church ſuppoſes that all her real and ſpiritual children are engaged in a continual warfare againſt ſin, the world, and the Devil. Theſe they ſolemnly engage to renounce at their baptiſm; againſt theſe ſhe expects them to fight manfully under Chriſt's banner to the end of their lives[i]: In proportion therefore as her viſible members are actually engaged in this conflict, and victorious in it; as "the old Adam is ſo buried, that the new man is raiſed up in them; as all carnal affections die in them, and all things belonging to the ſpirit live and grow in them; as they have power and ſtrength to have victory, and

(f) Rom. 9. 6. (g) Collect at the Nativity. (h) See general Confeſſion, Catechiſm, and Com. Ser. (i) See Baptiſmal Service.

to triumph over these grand enemies of their salvation," they answer to her notion of true Christians.—Our church teaches that the real children of God find in themselves a principle "mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things," and that this they believe to be "the spirit of Christ[k]:" In proportion therefore as her nominal professors are acquainted with these sanctifying and cheering effects of our religion, they approach to her standard of real Christianity.

All this then is very distinct from the mere profession of the national religion, or from a Christian profession connected with mere outward decency of character. To *renounce* the vanities of the world, and to carry on a daily warfare against it, must mean something very different from barely not disgusting it with scandalous immoralities. And is there then any impropriety in denominating what has thus its root in the heart and affections, spiritual and internal religion, in opposition to that which merely respects the external behaviour? Is it improper when the Redeemer thus "blesses men, by turning them away from their iniquities," delivering them from the condemnation and dominion of sin, and enabling them to "serve him without fear in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of their life[l]," to style it a present salvation? Or, Is it absurd and unintelligible to call these various exercises of the Christian's mind, and states of his conduct; his conflicts with these enemies of his peace; his attainments in humility, faith, hope, love, and other Christian graces, his *experience?* Name it, however, what men please, this undeniably is the nature of the Christianity taught by our Church.

The affirmation however is false, which represents us to teach "that no one knows Christ, or is a true Christian, until he can specify the precise time and hour of his conversion[m]."

(k) Art. 17. (l) See Acts iii. 26; Rom. vi. 14; v. 1; Luke i. 74, 75. (m) See Antijac. Rev. April, 1799, p. 369. See also Mr. Polwhele's Letter to Dr. Hawker, p. 14.

What we inſiſt upon is, that Profeſſors of Chriſtianity ſhould have ſcriptural ground for concluding that they have, in fact, turned unto God by true repentance, and that, in fact, they poſſeſs the diſpoſitions and characters of his faithful people. Yet ſurely, there is no abſurdity in the ſuppoſition that a wicked man may know ſomething of the time "when he turneth away from his wickedneſs, and does that which is lawful and right [n]." There is ſurely no abſurdity in putting to a profeſſed Chriſtian an inquiry like this: Did you at the time of your confirmation, when you profeſſed to do it, really enter upon the faithful obſervance of your baptiſmal engagements; and have you, in the general and habitual tenour of your life, been acting conſiſtently with theſe engagements ever ſince? If not: Have you done this at *any other period*, either previous or ſubſequent to this ordinance? Have you *now* the character of a true Chriſtian? It is ſurely very conceivable, that thoſe who once lived in a firm alliance with thoſe powers againſt which they now wage irreconcileable war; that thoſe who once lived in bondage to ſin, and to the fear of death and judgment, and have now a lively faith in God's mercy through Chriſt, and power over their corruptions; that thoſe "whoſe minds were once only on earthly things," and are now "drawn up to high and heavenly things," ſhould not only be aware of the change that has taken place, but alſo at what period of their life, and by what means, this change eſpecially commenced, or has been eſpecially promoted.

Our Church declares and pronounces all thoſe to be in a pardoned and abſolved condition, "that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe the goſpel." "They," ſhe alſo ſays, "who in act or deed ſin after their baptiſm, are waſhed by Chriſt's ſacrifice from their ſins, *when they turn again* to God unfeignedly [o]."—All therefore who do this have her warrant

(n) Ezekiel, xviii. 27. Hom. on Salva. p. 12.

(o) See her forms of Abſolution, and

to conſider themſelves in a ſtate of favour and acceptance with God, from the time when they thus turn unto him by true faith and repentance. The abſurdity on the ſubject will, therefore, perhaps, rather, be found with thoſe who treat all pretenſions to any knowledge of our religious ſtate with ridicule; and who can ſuppoſe men to repent, and believe, and be reformed, and carry on the Chriſtian warfare, as the Church preſcribes, and yet themſelves have ſcarce any perception of it.

3. But let us examine how the teaching of our *Opponents* agrees with that of the Church of England, on the ſubjects under conſideration. In reſpect to the firſt particular, the making ſo great a ſtir about the bleſſed name, and peculiar doctrines of Jeſus, they will readily allow us the excluſive credit of it. They will ſcarcely pretend that theſe topics make as prominent a figure in their Pulpits as in their Deſks. They will avow it of more importance to dwell upon the duties of morality.—Thus, Mr. Clapham "reckons not the inſiſting perpetually on the doctrines of faith, grace, juſtification, the new-birth, the indwelling of the ſpirit, and communion with God, among the excellencies of public inſtruction[p]."—Dr. Croft "is far from allowing that a diſcourſe is not a goſpel diſcourſe wherein the evangelical motives are paſſed over in ſilence[q]."—Mr. Benſon vindicates this omiſſion of evangelical doctrines, by the example of the Apoſtles, and ſays, that the "far greater part of the Epiſtles is employed in recommending practical duties[r]."—The whole purport of Mr. Haggitt's Sermon is to this effect[m]. And one argument by which he juſtifies the propriety of ſuch a conduct, is, that "every doctrinal point of our ſacred

(p) Sermon at Boroughbridge, p. 13. (q) Strictures on Paley, &c. p. 146. (r) See Sermons preached at Tunbridge Wells Chapel, by Martin Benſon, A. M. Miniſter of that Chapel, and Rector of Merſtham, Surrey, 1ſt, p. 5, 7. (m) Viſitation Sermon, paſſim.

religion[n]," is fully taught in our "Liturgy!"—"It is," confeſſes Mr. Jones, as we have ſeen above, "too commonly known againſt our preachers, that they *neglect the goſpel*, and take what they call good *natural religion* into the Pulpit[s]."—"Of late times," adds Biſhop Horne, "there hath been a prejudice in favour of good *moral preaching*; as if the people might do very well, or even better, without the knowledge of the Chriſtian myſteries[t]."

Nay, it is an eſtabliſhed "maxim" among the Clergy, Biſhop Horſley informs us, "That it is more the office of a Chriſtian teacher, to preſs the *practice* of religion upon the conſciences of his hearers, than to inculcate and aſſert its *doctrines*; and that *moral duties* conſtitute the *whole*, or by far the better part, of practical Chriſtianity[v]." And this "Infrequency in the pulpit of thoſe ſubjects which conſtitute the peculiar doctrines of Chriſtianity," the Biſhop of Durham, after "the moſt diligent view of the ſubject," conceives to be an eſpecial cauſe of the preſent deplorable ſtate of religion among us[w]. In ſhort, as we have ſhown at large in a preceding Chapter[x], the vindications of this ſtrain of preaching by one claſs of Divines, the confeſſions of another, and the complaints of a third, in reſpect to it, render the fact undeniable, that this is the prevalent mode of preaching among the miniſters in queſtion. But our Church, it has appeared, purſues a different plan. The doctrines and principles peculiar to the Goſpel conſtitute the prominent features of her forms of faith and worſhip, and other theological writings.—Here again then theſe Divines deviate from their acknowledged ſtandard, and rather act in oppoſition to the premiſes they have undertaken to maintain.

We have further to inquire whether theſe Miniſters, like the Church, inculcate, upon all capable ſubjects, the abſolute

(n) Ibid. p. 14. (s) See above, p. 35. (t) Ibid. p. 40.
(v) Ibid. p. 39. (w) Ibid. p. 42. (x) The 1ſt.

neceſſity of *inward* and *practical Chriſtianity*, in order to ſalvation. This inquiry may ſeem as ſtrange, as much of what has already been advanced on the ſubject may have ſeemed unneceſſary. Its propriety muſt be determined by the ground for it which ſhall appear. It may, however, properly, here be premiſed, that it is no ſufficient argument againſt the reality of a certain kind of experience in religion, or of certain religious attainments, that the objector is unacquainted with any ſuch experience or attainments. He may not have uſed the proper means, or may be otherwiſe diſqualified. Nor is it any ſufficient evidence that the Chriſtian improperly aſcribes his repentance, comfort, and ſanctification to the influence of the Holy Spirit, becauſe he does not underſtand the *mode* of his divine operations; becauſe he can only aſcertain theſe operations by their *effects;* or becauſe, in many particular inſtances, he cannot diſtinguiſh them from the workings of his own mind.

On this principle, we might equally deny the ſuperintending Providence of God; for what know we of his ſecret counſels, and of the *manner* in which he effects his purpoſes? We might deny that there are certain inſtincts of animals, or powers of vegetation in nature; for what know we of the *mode* of their communication and operations? We might deny our own exiſtence; for who can fully explain the *mode* of this exiſtence? But as a man is equally certain of the *effects* of the wind blowing upon him, as he would be if he knew both "whence it cometh and whither it goeth;" ſo he who repents, believes, and obeys the goſpel; he who poſſeſſes the "love, joy, peace," and other graces, and diſpoſitions, which the ſcripture denominates "the fruit of the ſpirit[y]," and which, it aſſures us, can proceed from no other ſource, may as confidently aſcribe ſuch attainments to "the workings of the ſpirit of Chriſt," as if he underſtood more of the *manner* of his divine operations. The hackneyed objection therefore which is deduced from this conſideration, againſt the notion of Divine Agency and

(y) Gal. 5. 22.

Influence in the work of man's ſalvation, amounts to juſt nothing. And thoſe Divines who admit that this agency is neceſſary and rational at all, will find it a hard taſk to ſhow preciſely where it ceaſes to be ſo, and to convict thoſe of enthuſiaſm on the ſubject, who do not aſcribe more to ſuch influence than what is warranted in ſcripture.

But let us ſee how the teachers in queſtion ſpeak with reſpect to the neceſſity of internal and practical Chriſtianity, in order to ſalvation.—The Antijacobins then, in oppoſition to thoſe who contend for this kind of religion, ſay, "Our church ſuppoſes all who are baptized to be in a ſtate of ſalvation [z]." Now if this phraſe has any meaning, as it is here uſed, it muſt mean ALL whatever be their characters; for that baptized perſons who poſſeſs a Chriſtian character, are in this ſtate, the Divines they are oppoſing do not deny. By "a ſtate of ſalvation" they muſt alſo be underſtood to mean, a ſtate in which if men die, they will inherit the kingdom of heaven; for that all profeſſing Chriſtians are, ſo far in a ſtate of ſalvation, as to enjoy Church privileges, and the *means* of ſalvation, nobody denies.

Mr. Daubeny, in like manner, ſees no difference between the true Church of Chriſt and the national Church; repreſents profeſſed membership with this national ſociety as forming the line of diſtinction between the world which lieth in wickedneſs and a ſtate of condemnation before God, and thoſe who are in a ſtate of ſanctification and ſalvation; and ſpeaks indiſcriminately of all who have been regularly baptized, and remain in the eſtabliſhed communion, as "members of Chriſt's body," "partakers of Chriſt's ſpirit," "the peculiar property of Chriſt," and as having "a peculiar intereſt in him:" in other words, as "tranſlated from the world," "delivered from the powers of darkneſs," and "heirs with Chriſt of an eternal kingdom [a]." "Every

(z) April, 1799, p. 369.

(a) Guide, p. 15, 16, 171, 172, 234, and paſſim.

Chriſtian," that is, every *profeſſed* Chriſtian, he ſays again, after being called to reconſider the ſubject, who " is living in a ſtate of communion with the Church," namely with that " viſible ſociety" of Chriſtians, " where the Epiſcopal form of government is to be found, *is in the ſure road to ſalvation*[b]." Yet ſurely, the ſin of ſchiſm may be heinous, the miniſtrations of ſelf-conſtituted teachers preſumptuous and inefficacious, and the advantages of a conſcientious adherence to our eſtabliſhed Church ineſtimable, and this conſequence not follow.

The diſtinction between the national eſtabliſhment and the true Church of Chriſt, Mr. D. teaches, is " unneceſſary," and a " falſe diſtinction[v]." " That," he ſays, " may be a true Church, in which the pure word of God is not preached[x]." " That the ſpirituality of Divine Worſhip is eſſential to the very being and conſtitution of a Church, is more," he adds, " than will be granted; becauſe the Church of Chriſt has, at different times, been permitted to exiſt without it[w]." " You ſay," he obſerves to his antagoniſt, " The collection of believers is the Church of the living God: and *therefore* the Church of Chriſt, becauſe ſhe holds the truth. I ſhould rather ſay, that the Church holds the truth, becauſe ſhe is the Church of Chriſt[v]." To the ſame

---

(b) Appendix, Letter 7. p. 452; quoted alſo in the Antijacobin Review, Feb. 1800. p. 141. (v) Ibid. p. 475, 476. (x) Ibid. p. 452. (w) Ibid. p. 482. (v) Ibid. p. 481.—It is not a little remarkable that Lord Bacon's deſcription of the Church, which is appealed to both by Mr. Daubeny and Sir Richard Hill, makes directly againſt them both; and, in exact conformity with our 19th Article, and the idea we maintain, conſiders a proper regard to both *internals* and *externals* eſſential to a true Church. His Lordſhip's words are, " I believe . . . that there is an univerſal or Catholic Church of God, diſperſed over the face of the earth, which is Chriſt's ſpouſe, and Chriſt's body; being gathered of the fathers of the old world, of the church of the Jews, of the ſpirits of the faithful diſſolved, and the ſpirits of the faithful militant, and of the names yet to be born,

purport, a Correſpondent of the Antijacobin Reviewers obſerves, "A curious diſtinction has lately been found out between the Church of Chriſt, and the Church of England[t]."

Mr. Polwhele, conſiders it among the greateſt extravagancies, to think unfavourably of the ſtate of many "who every Lord's day, attend the ſervice of the church[c]." Yet ſurely he muſt have heard of the ſin of phariſaiſm, and the mere "form of Godlineſs," which our Lord and his Prophets and Apoſtles, ſo ſeverely reprehend. Surely his attention to ſuch ſubjects cannot be ſo ſuperficial, but he muſt know perſons who are in habits of occupying their pews in the pariſh church, and are yet notoriouſly guilty of ſome of thoſe ſins, of the which the ſcripture ſolemnly and repeatedly declares, "that they who do ſuch things ſhall not inherit the kingdom of God[d]."

According, however, to the ſame notion, Dr. Paley, Dr. Croft, and their admirers, teach, that the ſcripture titles of "elect," "called," "ſaints," being "in Chriſt," &c. "were intended in a ſenſe common to *all* Chriſtian converts," and that "the application of ſuch titles to diſtinguiſh individuals amongſt us, the profeſſors of Chriſtianity from one another[e]," argues the greateſt ignorance and preſumption.

---

which are already written in the book of life.——That there is alſo a viſible church, diſtinguiſhed by the outward works of God's covenant, and the receiving of the holy doctrine, with the uſe of the myſteries of God, and the invocation and ſanctification of his holy name.——That there is alſo an holy ſucceſſion in the prophets of the New Teſtament and fathers of the church, from the time of the Apoſtles and Diſciples, which ſaw our Saviour in the fleſh, unto the conſummation of the work of the miniſtry; which perſons are called from God by gift, or inward anointing; and the vocation of God followed by an outward calling and ordination of the church."—Works, Vol. iv. p. 457.

(t) Nov. 1799, p. 358. (c) Letter to Dr. Hawker, p. 38.
(d) See 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 19—21. (e) See Dr. P.'s Viſitation Ser. at Carliſle, 1777, p. 11, 12; Dr. C.'s Preface to his Thoughts, &c.; and Mr. Clapham's Sermon.

In further conformity to this doctrine, the ſcripture terms and phraſes "converſion," "regeneration," the becoming "dead to ſin" and "alive from the dead," the being made "ſons of God from children of wrath," and all the other paſſages of God's Word by which the *change* that leads to this difference, in the ſtate and characters of men, is repreſented, theſe Divines tell us, now "MEAN NOTHING;" that is, as they explain it "nothing to us, or to any one educated in a Chriſtian country[f]."

Such teachers, of courſe, have no idea of any thing that can properly be denominated internal and experimental Chriſtianity, or a ſalvation begun in this life. Thus, when Mr. Robinſon ſays, 'that believers can ſpeak of Chriſt's power, faithfulneſs, and love; of his ability to ſave, &c.; from their own *experience*;' "we are told," Mr. Ludlam affirms, "what is no more poſſible than that we ſhould ſpeak of Chriſt's miraculous cures from our own experience[g]." "With the like confuſion of ideas," Mr. L. proceeds, "we are aſked," 'whether by our *own experience* of his ability to ſave, we can ſtand forth as witneſſes of his reſurrection?' For "until we are *actually* ſaved," he ſays, namely, as he clearly means to be underſtood, after our death, "we cannot in ANY SENSE experience this ſalvation[h]." If however the authority of St. John is to be preferred to that of Mr. Ludlam, there is a ſenſe in which "He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the Witneſs in himſelf[i]." If the judgment of St. Paul is to be regarded there is a knowledge "of the power of Chriſt's reſurrection[k]" attainable here, perfectly diſtinct from the bare belief of the fact.

Again Mr. L. ſays, we hear 'of thoſe who have *experienced* deliverance by the power of Jeſus.' "Now," he obſerves, "whether this means deliverance from the *power* or

(f) Dr. P.'s Sermon, p. 15—19; and Dr. C.'s Abridgment of it. (g) Four Eſſays, p. 42. (h) Ibid. p. 43. (i) 1 John v. 10. (k) Philip. iii. 10.

the *punishment* of sin, the application of *experience* to either of these blessings is surely very improper, if not utterly unintelligible; because we are not yet in *possession* of either [l]." This is speaking out. We know however where it is taught that Christ "saves his people from their sins[m];" blesses them "by turning them away from their iniquities[n];" "redeems them from all iniquity, and purifies them unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works[o];" "justifies and sanctifies them[p];" transforms them into "the image of him who created them[q];" and promises that "sin shall not have *dominion* over them[r]." And we have high authority for concluding that they who do not obtain "power and strength to have *victory* and to triumph over sin" here, will not be delivered from its punishment hereafter; that they who are not thus justified and sanctified, while they are in this world, will not be glorified in the next[s].

But let us attend to Mr. L.'s argument against this experience. "Did men," he says, "indeed NOW *experience* either of these blessings," namely, either deliverance from the *power* or the *punishment* of sin, "there would be an end of Christian faith; they would then walk not by *faith* but by *feeling*: for what a man possesses, i. e. experiences by the use of his senses, why doth he yet hope for? And what would then become of that earnest expectation of the creature, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God[t]?" Mr. L. could not but know, that Mr. Robinson does not speak of this deliverance as COMPLETE, in the present world. If therefore what is here advanced has *any* meaning, it denies that Christians now experience ANY MEASURE OR DEGREE of such deliverence. He is certainly, however, peculiarly unfortunate in this support of his opinion. So far, in the

(l) Four Essays, p. 43. (m) Matt. i. 21. (n) Acts iii. 26.
(o) Titus ii. 14. (p) Rom. viii. 29, 30. (q) Col. iii. 10.
(r) Rom. vi. 14. (s) See Rom. viii. 30. (t) Four Essays, p. 43.

Apoſtle's judgment, is the experience of "juſtification by faith, and peace with God, through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the love of God ſhed abroad in the heart, by the Holy Ghoſt," from making "an end of faith and hope," that it leads to the conſtant exerciſe of theſe graces, and makes men "rejoice in hope of the glory of God." So far from *deſtroying* it, he ſays expreſsly, "EXPERIENCE WORKETH HOPE[v]." Nay in the very paſſage from which Mr. L. quotes[w], they who "groan within themſelves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of their bodies;" the *complete* deliverance of their bodies and ſouls, at the reſurrection, NOW "*have* the *firſt fruits* of the Spirit;" "the earneſt," as it is elſewhere ſtyled, "of our inheritance[x];" the very thing for which Mr. R. contends. Although, therefore, the Chriſtian's bleſſedneſs in this world, compared with that which awaits him in heaven, only reſembles the *firſt-fruits*, when compared with the whole harveſt; yet as the firſt-fruits are not only a *pledge* of the enſuing harveſt, but really a *part of it*[y], ſo are the preſent graces and comforts of believers not only a pledge of their future inheritance, but a real *preſent* poſſeſſion, an earneſt and foretaſte of this felicity, a *part* of their *ſalvation itſelf*[o]; and it is not true, as Mr. Ludlam aſſirms, that Mr. Robinſon "in common with the *whole tribe* of goſpel miniſters, plainly miſtakes the *confidence* of *expectation*, for the *certainty* of *experience*[z]."

The whole myſtery in the matter is this: Chriſtianity engages to beſtow certain *preſent bleſſings*, and to produce certain *preſent effects*, as a preparation for a more perfect ſtate hereafter, upon all who, in the ſcripture ſenſe of the word, receive it. In proportion therefore as any avowed Chriſtians

---

(v) See Rom. v. 1—5. (w) Rom. viii. 19—25. (x) Epheſ. i. 14.
(y) See Cruden's Concordance on the words Earneſt and Firſt-fruits.
(o) "A believing Chriſtian," Lord Bacon ſays, "hath an eternal life begun in him," Works, Vol. iv. p. 506.
(z) Four Eſſays, p. 44.

are *poſſeſſed* of theſe bleſſings, and the *ſubjects* of theſe effects, they are ſaid to have Chriſtian *experience*. And this experience, this earneſt of their heavenly inheritance, this tranſcript of the goſpel on the heart, has been conſidered, by Divines [a] whoſe eminence Mr. L. is little likely to rival, as *one evidence* of the truth of our religion. All, however, for which we have here quoted him is to ſhow, how *very little* he expects Chriſtianity to do for men in this life; a poſition which is eſtabliſhed by his expreſs words.

Mr. Clapham, however, to the ſame purport, thinks, that the "experience" which the objects of his cenſure pretend to, "is neither perfectly intelligible as a fact, nor altogether concluſive as an evidence [z]." Mr. Daubeny ſays, "experimental conviction leads to deluſion [y]." Dr. Balguy ſpeaks of "pardon and ſalvation" as a "benefit to be *hereafter* conferred on us." The "preſent benefit" attending the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, he ſays, "is, the aſſurance of theſe *future* bleſſings [b]." We muſt mind, he ſays again, "the diſtinction between the grace ſignified, and the benefit *actually obtained*. The grace ſignified is redemption and ſalvation; the benefit immediately obtained is *only* the

---

(a) Dickenſon, in his Letters; Doddridge, Evidences; Uſher, Body of Divinity; Barrington, Ch. 1797; Porteus, Evidences; &c. &c. According to Biſhop Butler, even natural religion has its *inward Witneſs* reſulting from *Experience*. Speaking of the obſervable natural tendency of virtue to happineſs, and of vice to miſery, "We have then," he ſays, "a declaration, in ſome degree of *preſent effect*, from him who is ſupreme in nature, which ſide he is of, or what part he takes: a declaration for virtue, and againſt vice. So far therefore as a man is true to virtue, to veracity, &c. ſo far he is on the ſide of the divine adminiſtration, and co-operates with it: and from hence, to ſuch a man ariſes naturally a ſecret ſatisfaction and ſenſe of ſecurity, and implicit hope of ſomewhat further." Analogy, P. 1. C. 3. p. 80.

(z) Sermon, p. 12. (y) Appendix, p. 618. (b) Chap. 7. p. 314.

proſpect of that ſalvation [c]." Our church, we have ſeen, pronounces all who repent and believe, *pardoned and abſolved* while they are *here* [m], and prays that their "pardon may be ſealed in heaven *before they go hence* [n]." The phraſe "a death unto ſin, and a new birth unto righteouſneſs," in our Catechiſm, only means, Dr. B. ſays, "that the rite of baptiſm repreſents our entrance and admiſſion into the church of Chriſt [d]."

Mr. Polwhele accordingly, appears to have no idea either of the neceſſity or the meaning of a "perſonal" application to Chriſt, and a "perſonal intereſt in him [e]." To think ill of all profeſſed Chriſtians "except thoſe, who not only feel their ſins, but are enabled by the Holy Spirit to transfer their ſins to Chriſt, and apply his righteouſneſs to themſelves [f];" or, as he repeats the idea, who "may be ſenſible of their ſins, and favoured with a call from the Spirit [g]," he conceives muſt be a doctrine of dreadful operation in the conduct of life [h]. And, after mentioning the ſafe ſtate of the heathens, who act in conformity to the law which they are unto themſelves, he affirms, that to exclude thoſe whom he calls "*moral Chriſtians* from ſalvation," is making "it a truly unfortunate thing that they were born in a Chriſtian country, or admitted within the pale of the church [i]."——Biſhop Butler would teach him, that ſuch perſons may poſſeſs heathen morality, and yet be dangerouſly criminal from their want of ſuitable "religious regards to the SON, and to the HOLY GHOST;" and their violation of "the obligation we are under, of paying theſe religious regards to each of theſe divine perſons reſpectively, ariſing from the reſpective relations,

---

(c) Ibid. p. 315. (m) Above, p. 111. (n) Viſita. of Sick. (d) As above, p. 314. (e) Letter to Dr. Hawker, p. 44, &c. (f) Ibid. p. 46. (g) Ibid p. 48. (h) Ibid. p. 49. (i) Ibid. p. 47.

which they each ſtand in to us," as revealed by Chriſtianity [o]. But thus does Mr. Polwhele juſtify the apparently harſh ſaying of a Divine whom he reprobates, "that the *faith of a devil*, and the *life of a heathen*, make up what many call a *good Chriſtian*."

It ſhall only be added, that, agreeable to all this, every pretenſion to any *change* of ſtate and character, to any *marks* of *diſtinction* from the wicked, and mere formaliſts in religion, to any thing like the above *experience*, is treated by theſe Gentlemen with ridicule and contempt. Thus the Divine laſt mentioned ſpeaks of "the favoured few, who, in the ſaint's progreſs, are arrived at ſuch a proficiency, as to be admitted into the preſence of God, and ſuffered, for an exhibition of their powers, to wreſtle with the Devil [k]." This ſurely is ſporting not only with the notion of the above diſtinction, but with the Appellation the ſcripture aſſigns to true Chriſtians, with the idea of their peculiar exerciſes and attainments, and with that of the great Adverſary with whom they have to contend. In a ſimilar ſtrain, however, ſuch phraſes as "the Saints," "the Elect," "the Lord's people [l]," are conſtantly uſed by this champion for genuine Chriſtianity. In the ſame ſpirit, he largely entertains himſelf with the ideas that the objects of his ridicule "ſuſtain the *conflicts* of the tempter;" that "the Devil is an *odd character*" with them; that they are "ſtill ſtruggling with the enemy;" and that they "eſcape not the attacks of this infernal Spirit [m]!"—In this manner ſpeaks Mr. Polwhele reſpecting the Being whom our church repreſents as one of three *grand enemies* of our ſalvation, and whom we ſolemnly engage, at our baptiſm, "to renounce, and to fight manfully againſt, unto our life's end!"

(o) Analogy, Part 2. Ch. i. §. 2. (k) P. 22. (l) See ibid. p. 33, 49, 80; and ſecond Letter, p. 17, 26, 28. (m) See firſt Lett. p. 22.—31.

Again: To be "awakened to a ſenſe of our ſins," is to make "religion the gloomieſt thing upon earth[n]." To have our minds drawn up to high and heavenly things, is, to be exalted "above all earthy connections or concerns[o];" and to labour under a "happier madneſs[z]." To pretend to any *actual* guidance, ſanctification, or comfort of the Holy-Ghoſt, is Enthuſiaſm, without the benefit of a hearing: And notwithſtanding theſe Gentlemen profeſs to believe "in God the Holy Ghoſt, who ſanctifieth them and and all the elect people of God;" notwithſtanding they pray, that God may "give his Holy Spirit" to every child which they baptize; notwithſtanding they conſtantly pray, that his "Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule their hearts;" that he would "cleanſe the thoughts of their hearts by the Inſpiration of his Holy Spirit," that his "Holy Spirit may be ever with them," and that he may "not take his Holy Spirit from them;"—yet in their judgment, the claim to *Inſpiration* is "chimerical;" they yet ſpeak with indignation of certain modern religioniſts, "who" they tell us, "to all the nonſenſe of a Calviniſtical Creed have added the chimerical claim to Inſpiration[x]." They truſt, at their Ordination, that they "are inwardly moved by the Holy-Ghoſt to take upon" them the office of Miniſters[y]; they "pray earneſtly," and wait in ſilence,

(n) See p. 82, 45, 53, 57, 79. (o) See Ibid, p. 21, 51, 57. (z) See Warburton on Grace, p. 204. (x) See Archdeacon Balguy's 1ſt Ch. p. 171. (y) This conſideration which many treat ſo lightly, was the "main reaſon," why the pious Mr. Boyle did not enter into Holy Orders. "Not having felt within himſelf an inward motion to it by the Holy Ghoſt," his Biographer ſays, "he durſt not take that ſtep, leſt he ſhould have lied to the Holy Ghoſt." ſo ſolemnly and ſeriously did this great man judge of this matter. See his Life, as above, p. 57. See the neceſſity of both the *internal* and *external* call to the Miniſtry properly enforced, in Arch-biſhop Secker's Inſtructions for Candidates for Orders; in the Charge of the Biſhop of Oſſory, 1796; and in the quotation from Lord Bacon, above, p. 116.

for the Inſpiration of God's "Holy Spirit;" they unite with the Biſhop in as ſtrong language in favour of Inſpiration as can well be uttered [x]; and yet, they conſider thoſe perſons "Enthuſiaſts, who think, or pretend to think, that the Holy Spirit over-rules them in their words and actions [w];" yet, their definition of the Enthuſiaſt, whom they abhor, is, that "he is, in his own conceit, the *inſpired* of heaven [v]!" And thus are the moſt ſober and ſcriptural notions of our church, on the ſubject, diſcarded or confounded with groundleſs conceits, and wild extravagancies.—If the perſons here vindicated pretend to inſpiration in any *ſenſe* or *degree* which the church does not, we ſhall be glad to ſee the circumſtanc[e] roved by fair quotation from their *own writings*.

Thus then do theſe teachers join

——————"A world who treat
"All but their own experience as deceit."

In all theſe ways do they afford ground for the "opinion" to which Arch-biſhop Secker ſays, "our irregularities and diviſions are greatly owing," namely, "that we are *uſually* indifferent about *vital inward* religion [t]." All this, ſurely, looks like openly diſpenſing with any ſuch

(x) Such ſurely is this:

"Come, Holy Ghoſt, our ſouls inſpire,
And lighten with celeſtial fire.
Thou the anointing ſpirit art,
Who doſt thy ſevenfold gifts impart.
Thy bleſsed Unction from above,
Is comfort, life, and fire of love.
Enable with perpetual light
The dulneſs of our blinded ſight.
Anoint and cheer our ſoiled face
With the abundance of thy grace."——&c. See the whole Solemn Service.

(w) See Mr. Polwhele's 3d Letter to Dr. Hawker, p. 59. Note.
(v) Ibid. 1ſt Letter, p. 8. (t) Ch. 2d, p. 83.

Chriſtianity. This, ſurely, is reſembling the conduct of certain deluded perſons of old, whoſe fate ſhould be a warning to us, ſaying, "The Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, are theſe[s]," whatever be their diſobedience; ſubſtituting the means for the end, church privileges for true religion.—But had theſe been the ſentiments of our Reformers, they might well have ſpared the ſacrifice of their lives. The whole Church of Rome was *profeſſedly* Chriſtian, and uſed the ordinance of Baptiſm.

We know how theſe Gentlemen, at other times, ſpeak of repentance, faith, and obedience, as the conditions of juſtification, and actual ſalvation. This it is not our buſineſs to reconcile with their preſent language. Indeed what may on other occaſions be inculcated, is of little importance, if "cum ventum ad verum eſt," the point is thus relinquiſhed. It muſt ſeem, from the whole tenor of what has now appeared, that although they *ſpeak* of theſe things, yet that a renewed heart and a holy life are not made a SINE QUA NON in the character of a true Chriſtian; that a performance of the baptiſmal covenant is not *ſo* inſiſted upon as to exclude all hopes of Chriſtian ſalvation from thoſe who neglect it. But our argument does not require us to decide upon this matter.——What we inſiſt upon, in concluſion of our inquiry, is this, that theſe Divines muſt hold—Either, that ALL profeſsed Chriſtians, who are members of our church, *whatever be their characters*, are in a ſtate of acceptance with God, and would go to heaven ſhould they die in their preſent ſtate;—or, that only SOME of ſuch perſons are in this ſtate; namely, thoſe whoſe *characters* correſpond with their profeſſion.

If the former poſition be maintained; we pronounce it, without the ſmalleſt fear of refutation, licentious, unſcrip-

(s) Jer. vii. 4.

tural, and directly oppoſite to the moſt plain and expreſs doctrine of our church. If the latter propoſition be adhered to; then muſt they admit a *diſtinction* between "the good and the evil," between real and merely nominal Chriſtians, and the neceſſity of the latter being *changed and converted;* then will their reprobation of others for making this diſtinction and inculcating this neceſſity, be found abſurd; then will it be obvious, that it is not, as they would perſuade us, the Word of God, but their language about *all* baptized perſons being in a ſtate of ſalvation, which "means nothing."——If it is perſiſted in, that, in making this ideal diſtinction among the profeſſors of Chriſtianity, no perſons who poſſeſs outward decency of character, or as they term it, no "moral Chriſtians," ſhould be ſuppoſed radically defective; this is acknowledging in ſo many words, that *internal* and *ſpiritual* Chriſtianity is diſpenſed with.

In reference then to the whole which has been advanced in this chapter, we appeal to all competent judges to ſay, whoſe teaching moſt reſembles that of the Church and her Reformers on theſe ſubjects; *ours* who make Chriſt and his peculiar doctrines the ſoul which animates the whole body of our divinity, or *theirs* who make ſo little uſe of theSaviour and theſe doctrines; *ours* who thus inſiſt upon internal and practical Chriſtianity, or *theirs* who reſt ſo much upon mere externals, and uſe the language which has been exhibited?

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY CALIFORNIA

CHAP. IV.

The inquiry purſued with regard to the Doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN, *and the conſequent* STATE AND CHARACTER OF MAN, *in this world,* AS A SINNER.

LITTLE doubt, it is preſumed, can remain, in the intelligent and impartial mind, *whoſe* pretenſions are beſt founded on our ſubject, from what has been advanced in general upon it. We wiſh, however, that the truth, on which ever ſide it lies, may be placed in every light, and, if poſſible, rendered unqueſtionably conſpicuous. With this view, we will now particularize ſome of the moſt important points of Chriſtian doctrine, reſpecting which the preſent controverſy chiefly ſubſiſts, and which are noticed by our opponents. In doing this, we muſt conſtantly keep in remembrance what has already been proved; namely, that our church is certainly to be interpreted according to the moſt *natural and full ſenſe* of her words, and that a *practical* acquaintance with her doctrines is required.——We will begin our particulars with the doctrine of original ſin, and the conſequent ſtate and character of man conſidered as a ſinner.

It is not eaſy to conceive how any perſons who really believe the Bible can conſider this an unintereſting doctrine. "It is obvious from the New-Teſtament," even Mr. Locke is conſtrained to obſerve, "that the doctrine of redemption, and conſequently of the Goſpel, is founded on the ſuppoſition of *Adam's fall* [a]." "Revelation," the great Biſhop Butler obſerves, "ſuppoſes the *world to be in a ſtate of ruin*, a ſup-

(a) Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, at the beginning.

position which seems the very *ground* of the Christian dispensation[z]." "In the corruption and depravity of human nature," an eminent modern Prelate adds, "are founded all the peculiar precepts and doctrines of the gospel[b]." This, with its invariable consequence, in all capable subjects, actual transgression, are the *disease*, and, in the very nature of the thing, only as the malady is rightly understood, will there be a proper solicitude respecting the remedy.

2. On this subject then, Dr. Croft, on behalf of himself and Brethren in sentiment, expresses himself thus: "Though we admit the dire effects of original sin, yet we do not admit them to the *degree* so warmly contended for[c]." And this is a true statement of the case. They do not avowedly, and expressly, and in every sense, deny the doctrine and its awful effects; this would be exceeding both the Socinian and the Deist[d]; but it is their uniform endeavour to *evade* or *extenuate*, the plain representations of scripture on the subject. But let us further learn from the Divines under consideration themselves, in what manner they treat these doctrines, and what it is which they really admit respecting them. It may perhaps assist our inquiry to keep in view three particulars in the condition under which we are considering man; namely, his *corruption* or sinfulness, his *desert*, and his *impotence*.

Some then, among the most exalted of these teachers, deny the *corruption* of our nature by the fall *altogether*, and endeavour to propagate this notion in the church. This is the professed and notorious doctrine of Dr. Paley's great model, the late Bishop Law, as his works testify unquestion-

(z) Analogy, Part 2. Ch. v. § 5. See also Part 2. Ch. i. § 2. (b) Bishop of Durham, Char. 1797, p. 3. (c) Thoughts, &c. p. 19. (d) See Taylor on Original Sin, p. 27, 30, 37, 164; Dr. Priestley's Familiar Illustration, p. 11; and Bishop Watson's Char. 1795. p. 68.

ably [e]. It is the doctrine of the eminent Biſhop Warburton, to whom, as we have ſeen, our opponents ſo generally refer us as a ſtandard [f]. If this prelate does not abſolutely avow the ſentiment, he certainly approaches infinitely near ſuch an avowal. "Adam," he obſerves, "ate, and became as he was at firſt created, *mortal*[g]." "It is aſtoniſhing," he ſays, "that *any other death* ſhould have been underſtood by his ſentence[h]." He refers us alſo, like Biſhop Law, to Mr. Locke's Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, where the doctrine is taught unequivocally[i]. At the moſt, "What phyſical contagion we contracted at our birth, it is," he ſays, "of little uſe to inquire[k]." The ſame appears to be the doctrine which is propagated by the celebrated Biſhop Watſon. It is impoſſible to be more expreſs in denying the depravity of our nature than Dr. Taylor is, both in his treatiſe on Original Sin, and his Scheme of Scripture Divinity in which he refers to the other for explanation; yet upon this latter Work his Lordſhip beſtows the moſt unqualified encomiums. "It deſerves," he ſays, "to be generally known; and has been much ſought after by the Clergy; and he thought he ſhould do them an acceptable ſervice, in making it a part of his collection[l]." In nearly the ſame manner he treats the above mentioned Work of Mr. Locke, with its vindications againſt the orthodox Dr. Edwards, and other Works of a ſimilar tendency[m]. Mr. Fellowes alſo ſpeaks out. "The ſin of Adam," this Gentleman thinks himſelf imperiouſly called upon 'as a Miniſter of the Church of England' to affirm, "*did not vitiate the nature* of mankind. The puniſhment inflicted on Adam for his tranſgreſſion was death, and temporal miſery. His poſterity therefore are

---

(e) See his Conſiderations on the Theory of Rel. third Edit. p. 45, Note c. p. 101, 325. (f) See above, p. 28. (g) Divine Legation, B. 9. Vol. iii. Works, p. 634. (h) Ibid. p. 638. (i) See the beginning of it. (k) Divine Lega. as above, p. 639. (l) Tracts, Vol. i. Contents. (m) Ibid. Vol. iv. Contents.

born to mortality and to ſuffering; but they are *not born either in guilt or in wickedneſs*. They are *not born diſpoſed to evil and indiſpoſed to good*. They are *born innocent*; and this was certainly the opinion of our Saviour[z]."

By others, the hiſtory, in the firſt part of Geneſis, reſpecting the diſobedience of our firſt Parents, is conſidered as being "not a *literal* deſcription of *fact*, but an *allegorical* ſtory, like the Pilgrim's Progreſs." "Many ſerious and thinking Chriſtians," Profeſſor Heys ſays, have thus conſidered it. And for this reaſon he ſuggeſts a "*doubt* whether the diſorderly propenſities of man were owing to Adam's tranſgreſſion," and whether the compilers of our ninth and tenth Articles meant to affirm that they are[n]!

Another method of treating the ſubject of the Fall of man is, to repreſent it as a tranſaction "of which we are very obſcurely and imperfectly informed." This is the famous Dr. Balguy's manner of ſpeaking concerning it; which Dr. Hey obſerves, "ſeems rather to imply, that he would not lay much ſtreſs on a ſtate ſo little underſtood[o]." Accordingly, as the ſame Gentleman informs us, "Dr. B. has only two very ſhort expreſſions relating to original ſin;" and other "valuable authors," he tells us, "have not dwelt much on it[p]." This view of the ſubject the learned Profeſſor appears to adopt. "Every thinking man," he ſays, will keep it in mind. And on this ground alſo he founds the above *doubt*[q]. Mr. Ludlam is full on the point. Having obſerved that a change of character ſucceeded in Adam in conſequence of his diſobedience, "how far," he proceeds, "or in what manner, this change affected his *poſterity*, we are not clearly told[r]." "Though the ſcriptures of the Old

(z) See "The Anti-Calviniſt; by Robert Fellowes, M. A. of St. Mary Hall, Oxford; Curate of Harbury; and Author of a Picture of Chriſtian Philoſophy, &c. &c." p. 15.

(n) See Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 137, 152, 189. (o) Ibid. p. 154. (p) Ibid. p. 176, 177. (q) Ibid. p. 152, 163, 219, 188, 255. (r) Six Eſſays, p. 83.

Teſtament," he ſays again, "acquaint us, in very expreſs and ſtrong terms, of man's departure from holineſs, they no where aſcribe this change of character to the ſin of Adam[s]." ... "But if the account of the fall in the ſcriptures of the Old Teſtament is *exceding general*, that given in thoſe of the New *is no leſs ſo*[t]." The 12th verſe of the 5th of Romans, Mr. L. interprets thus: "So, i. e. in like manner as death paſſed upon Adam for *his* offence, death paſſed upon all men for *their* offences, for that, i. e. becauſe *all* have ſinned. That is, death paſſed upon all men NOT FOR ADAM's tranſgreſſion, but their own[v]!"

It is further maintained, that we are certainly not "born guilty." To affirm that we are, Dr. Balguy ſays, "is either unintelligible, or the thing itſelf impoſſible[x]." Nay, in Mr. Ludlam's judgment, it is highly "unſcriptural and abſurd" to ſay, "that children diſcover a *proneneſs* to ſin in their earlieſt infancy[y];" and to ſuppoſe, "that men have AN *innate tendency* to diſobedience[z]." And, that we ſhall be *actual* ſinners, is not, we are taught, an *unavoidable* and *certain* event. "We do not hold," Dr. Hey ſays, "that our paſſions are *neceſſarily and unavoidably* exceſſive or defective; but only, that from experience it is to be *expected*, on a footing of *probability*, that they will be ſo[a]." And although our *ſpecies*, taken collectively, may be conſidered as offenders, *individuals*, it is intimated, may be *perfectly innocent*. "When," Dr. Hey, treating on our ſubject, ſays, "members of any community are ſaid to offend, as ſuch, it is worth obſerving, that they may be all the while *perfectly innocent* in their *individual* capacity[b]."

Theſe poſitions the learned Profeſſor aſſumes, illuſtrates, and appears to conſider as incontrovertible. Mr. Ludlam ac-

---

(s) Ibid. p. 86. (t) Ibid. p. 91. (v) Ibid. p. 91.
(x) Ch. 7. p. 300. (y) Six Eſſays, p. 82. (z) Ibid. p. 97.
(a) Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 165, 178, 188—190, 219. (b) Ibid. p. 148, 167, 168, 173, 179.

cordingly affirms, that "When Paul aſſerts, that the Epheſians 'were by *nature* the children of wrath;' . . . the word *nature* muſt, of neceſſity, be underſtood, in a figurative or metaphorical ſenſe; and he only means by this expreſſion to point out the very general prevalence of wickedneſs amongſt the Epheſians, even as it alſo prevailed amongſt other heathens; juſt as if it was the appointed law of their nature [c]." "A ſimilar mode of ſpeaking," Mr. L. adds, "is adopted in all thoſe paſſages (of ſcripture) which ſpeak of the corruption of mankind as UNIVERSAL, as if there were not a ſingle inſtance to be found of the contrary [d]." "We are told," this writer further obſerves, "that a change in the ſituation and circumſtances of our firſt parents took place immediately in conſequence of their offence. How far any further change took place in their moral character, we are not informed; nor whether, or in what manner, their departure from holineſs occaſioned that wonderful change in the moral character of their immediate deſcendant and his offspring. But the change in Adam's character did not affect the moral character of ALL his immediate deſcendants, any more than that of Cain did [z]." It will be remembered that this Divine is extolled by the Britiſh Critic [y]. And, doubtleſs, it has been among theſe *innocent individuals* who have eſcaped the general contagion of our race, where Mr. Polwhele found thoſe who, he ſays, "reſembled too much the innocence and ſimplicity of little children to be *ſenſible of pollution from ſin*, and, conſequently, were never drawn by the ſpirit unto Chriſt, to be cleanſed from ſuch a leproſy [e]."

And when, in the more orthodox ſenſe, the univerſal corruption of our nature is admitted, this corruption is conſidered as but *partial* and *ſuperficial* in its nature. This is implied in the ſoft terms by which it is characterized. The phraſes "human frailty," "human infirmities," "human errors,"

(c) Six Eſſays, p. 90. (d) Ibid. (z) Ibid. p. 85.
(y) See above, p. 15. (e) Letter to Dr. Hawker, p. 49. Note.

"the defects of human nature," and "the imperfections of our nature [f]," are certainly not expressive of *radical and fundamental* depravity. But this sentiment is avowed expressly. Thus, Dr. Croft affirms, that they "do not admit the effects of original sin to the *degree* so warmly contended for [g]." The persons with whom his contention subsists are Arminians not less than Calvinists. He does not therefore hold this doctrine to the extent which great numbers of even the former do; and had *he* been our representative at the famous Synod of Dort, he would have been deemed heterodox by both parties.

Thus also is the sentiment strongly avowed by Mr. Polwhele, in his comment on the following passage of Dr. Hawker. Speaking of the Grace of God, "It is not," Dr. H. says, "exerted in supporting what is already strong; not in helping what possesses some power; not in cleansing what is in part holy; but in taking such as are of the mass of helpless infirm and polluted creatures of the dust, and purifying them for his glory." Upon this passage Mr. P. addresses the Doctor thus: "According to the most obvious construction of your meaning, I may deduce from this sentence, that dangerous axiom: 'the greater the sinner, the greater the saint.' If the Holy Spirit exert itself only in purifying those who are polluted by sin, what have we to do, but to gather about us the filthiness of the flesh, as fast as we can, in order to render ourselves fit objects of Grace? 'Let us sin, that grace may abound.' If this be not the sense of the passage, I must leave it to be interpreted by those who dream dreams and see visions [h]."

(f) See Sermons by Dr. Samuel Carr, late Prebendary of St. Paul's, London, Ser. 2. p. 24, 29; Ser. 3. p. 52; Ser. 30. p. 33; Benson's Sermons, p. 227; Croft's Strictures, p. 50; Mr. Polwhele's Letter to Dr. Hawker, p. 52. (g) Thoughts, p. 19, 20. (h) Letter, &c. p. 21, 22.

Again: Having aſcribed a ſhocking tenet to the Calviniſts, reſpecting infants, "It is perfectly conſiſtent," Mr. P. ſays, "with the doctrine of *original ſin*[i]." From theſe, and ſimilar paſſagesto be found in this author, it would be moſt natural to conclude that he diſclaims a belief in the doctrine of our original depravity *altogether*; but he *ſays* he does not[k], and ſhall therefore be allowed to hold *all* that perſons uſing this language can be ſuppoſed to hold, on the ſubject. To the ſame purport, the affirmation, "that *all* the faculties of the ſoul feel the dreadful effects of the original apoſtacy," is ſtrongly objected againſt[l]. With many, accordingly, the malady of our nature is confined almoſt ſolely to the *paſſions*, while the *underſtanding* and the *will* are conſidered as little hurt[m]; and not a few conceive that we have ſtill "good hearts[n]." The former mean no more by the corruption of human nature, than that there is a probability of what they call our inferior propenſities encroaching upon our ſuperior natural faculties[o]; and the plain doctrine of the latter is, that we are ſound and right at the bottom, and only liable to a few occaſional and external miſdemeanours.

Theſe then, and ſuch like, are the ſentiments of theſe Divines with reſpect to the exiſtence and extent of human depravity. Equally ſlight, therefore, of courſe, are their ideas reſpecting its *evil* and *deſert*. And in fact, as we have already ſhown[r], by many of them no further evil is connected with the firſt tranſgreſſion than that hereby man became "mortal." The celebrated expoſitor of our arti-

---

(i) Ibid. p. 48, Note. (k) 2d Letter, p. 25, n. (l) See Mr. Ludlam's 6 Eſſays, p. 85. (m) See Ibid. p. 92, &c.; 4 Eſſays, p. 27—36; Biſhop Warburton's Doctrine of Grace, p. 39. n. p. 96; and Andrews' Scripture Doctrine of Grace, p. 115—121. (n) See a Review of the Policy, Doctrines, &c. of the Methodiſts, p. 24. (o) See Mr. Ludlam's 6 Eſſays, p. 78, &c.; Nor. Lect. Vol. 3. p. 151, 158, 163, 215; (r) Above, p. 130,

cles, Bishop Burnet, clearly leaves it as his opinion that the effects of this offence on Adam's posterity are only "temporal judgments[s]." "It is no where clearly asserted in scripture," Mr. Ludlam says, "though it is by certain Divines, that the death denounced against Adam's disobedience was *eternal* death[t]." Dr. Bennet restrains the meaning of our Church, on the subject, to those who commit *actual* sins. "Her doctrine," he says, "is only this, 'that original sin deserveth God's wrath and damnation' in those who feel the effects of it working in them, and producing *evil actions*[v]." Dr. Hey says, "the expression is more terrible in the sound, than in the sense[w]." It does not, he teaches, "imply judgment after death;" nor "any determinate degree of evil," howsoever small; nor any judgment or punishment whatever that is certainly passed and inflicted[x].

Nor have these Theologians more awful ideas of the nature and consequences of *actual* sin. This has in part appeared already, from the mild epithets by which they represent sin[y], and from their dispositon to treat all persons as true Christians, in the favour of God, and in the road to heaven, who profess Christianity, whether or not they lead a holy life; or at the least, to consider no course of conduct as constituting a wicked man, except that of flagrant enormity[z]. This will appear fully hereafter, when we examine their notions of morality[a]. Then will it be found how slight an evil the violation of the whole first Table of the Law is considered, and how almost entirely the supposed evil of sin is confined to its effects on society[b]: Then will Dr. Croft assure us how necessary, and

(s) See Expo. of Art. 9th, p. 115, 116, compared with his Preface, p. 6. (t) 6 Essays, p. 23. (v) Directions for reading the Articles, p. 73—5. (w) Nor. Lect. Vol. 3. p. 154. (x) Ibid. p. 155. (y) Above, p. 133. (z) Above, p. 114—127. (a) Ch. 7. below. (b) Ibid. §. 1, part 3; and §. 2,

proper, and harmleſs it is, ſometimes "to tell a lie [c];" and that "ſwearing and drunkenneſs," and ſuch "other glaring vices, are the ſigns of a thoughtleſs mind, rather than of a depraved heart [d]:" Then ſhall we find ſomething very like Apologies for deviations from the Divine Law [e].

So exceedingly lax are their ideas of the evil of ſin, of whatever kind! So ſmall an offence, in the ſight of the God of Heaven, do they eſteem it! His expreſs denunciations of vengeance againſt it, they have therefore various methods of evading or ſoftening. The moſt awful expreſſions of this threatened judgment, which our Church adopts into her forms, ſuch as "to be damned," and "to periſh," and that before noticed, to be ſubject to "God's wrath and damnation," even with the epithet "everlaſtingly" annexed to them, they teach, may only imply a very *ſmall* degree of puniſhment. "Every ſine, however ſmall," Dr. Hey, treating on the ſubject, ſays, "is an *everlaſting* puniſhment [f]." Yea, according to their reaſoning, the *difference* of condition between a perſon who believes and is *ſaved*, and one who diſbelieves and is *damned* may be infinitely trifling [g]! The mention of God's ſolemn threatenings in the pulpit, they call "interlarding the diſcourſe with ſlices of hell and damnation [h]," and a high characteriſtic of its methodiſm and abſurdity.

Even Mr. Gilpin is ſceptical reſpecting the *eternity* of the future puniſhments of ſin, and would by all means baniſh the ſubject from pulpit topics.——Commenting on Matt. xxv. 46, "The eternity of future puniſhments," he obſerves, "hath occaſioned much controverſy among divines. Inſtead of taking part with either ſide, I am rather inclined to ſhow the impropriety of bringing the queſtion

(c) Ibid. (d) Ibid. (e) Ibid. (f) Vol. 3. p. 106, 107, 111. (g) See ibid; and p. 108; and Dr. Paley's Moral and Polit. Phil. Ch. on Virtue, p. 48. (h) Review of Policy, &c. p. 28.

at all into discussion. In the first place, as inquiries of this kind must end, as they begun, in *uncertainty*, it is useless to discuss them. . . . The discussion of such a question appears to have a *bad tendency*. . . . God seems plainly, for his own wise reasons, to have left this great point *uncertain* at least, or, if not uncertain, leaning rather towards the positive side. . . . When the subject is so *uncertain*, and a mistake so dangerous, we should rather think in private, than run the risk of misleading others, in a point which, if proved, might be of dangerous consequence; and can hardly in any light be of importance [x]."——And this opinion of Mr. Gilpin is highly approved by the British Critic [y].

Nay, the representing religion to "impose the command to believe this, and to do that, under pain of *eternal* perdition [i]," is enumerated among the causes of infidelity. "We are not called upon by our Church," it is declared, "to subscribe to the eternity of hell torments, nor even to condemn those, who affirm that all men will be finally saved [k]."

We have just to particularize their notions of man's *natural impotence* in respect to spiritual things. That he can *wholly* convert and save himself; or that, when the doctrines of the gospel are proposed to him, he can savingly embrace and acceptably obey them, without some kind or degree of further aid from above, few perhaps, except the Socinians, will openly maintain. But then, by the Divines in question, he is supposed capable, by his own natural powers, of doing *a great deal* toward these ends; and this too, *previous* to his reception of any such assistance. Thus, after quoting a passage from Dr. Hawker purporting that, although

---

(x) Sermons and Hints, &c. by Wm. Gilpin, Prebendary of Salisbury, and Vicar of Boldre. (y) Jan. 1801. (i) Mr. Polwhele's Letter to Dr. Hawker, p. 82. (k) Nor. Lect. Vol. 2, p. 390.

men attend to the external forms of religion, and endeavour after the performance of moral duties, yet, that till "the Lord put his Spirit into them," they have no spiritual life; Mr. Polwhele exclaims, "According to this doctrine, our regeneration depends not, in the slightest degree, upon *ourselves*: it is the sole effect of the Divine agency[l]." This Mr. P. conceives is every way absurd. But would *his* notion be more absurd than it is, if he should talk of our *creation* depending in somedegree upon *ourselves?*

Thus also, Mr. Ludlam teaches, that "Scripture no where says that the intellectual faculties of the human mind are injured by Adam's transgression[m];" that men do not want *ability*, but "attention[n];" and, that God has put their "future happiness *almost wholly* in their *own power*[o]."

Thus, Bishop Watson, from Bishop Fowler, says, "There is not a promise throughout the whole Gospel, but its performance depends upon some duty of holiness to be on our parts *first* performed, or at least heartily endeavoured[p]."

And thus does Mr. Benson fully teach. "We must," he says, "*convince ourselves of sin;* our conviction of it must be succeeded by a godly sorrow; *that* if it is valid, will work in us a repentance not to be repented of; in other words, a degree of penitence which will induce us, from motives superior to any worldly temptation, to persevere in the fear of God, and in the practice of true religion. . . . Repentance is made up of these ingredients. And, as we collect from the Gospel, it is not only necessary to salvation, but it is requisite also that it take effect, *before we can hope for any aid*, whether temporal or eternal from the Gospel[q]!" His notions also are, that men are capable "by holiness of living, and an abhorrence of vice, of *recom-*

(l) Letter, p. 11. (m) 6 Essays, p. 92. (n) Ibid, p. 101; and passim. (o) Ibid, p. 78, and 2d of 4 Essays. (p) Tracts, Vol. 6. p. 322. (q) Ser. 3. p. 51.

mending themſelves to the mercy of God, and *rendering themſelves worthy the mediation of Jeſus Chriſt;*" and that Chriſt calls "only to the righteous[r]!" According to Mr. Fellowes, we are "not born *diſpoſed* to evil and *indiſpoſed* to good;" but "innocent and ripe for heaven;" and naturally "poſſeſs a capacity to perform the ſeveral duties required of us in the goſpel." And to think otherwiſe, he maintains, is, to "ſuppoſe Chriſt.... guilty of a palpable abſurdity, and diabolical injuſtice[z]!"

Some of them maintain that "without any ſupernatural aſſiſtance," any "divine illumination," man's powers of reaſon are ſufficient to underſtand the ſcriptures, and attain to all neceſſary *knowledge* in Divine things; or as they expreſs it, in ſo many words, that "the knowledge required of men is attainable by the cuſtomary uſe of their natural faculties[s]."

It is the doctrine of nearly the whole body, that his Will is free to chooſe what is good[t]. He is able, "as mere man," they teach, "to perform ſuch good works as naturally make him *inclined* to accept of a pure religion," "as *attract the regard* of the Lord of Life;" "as may be a great *recommendation* of him to God;" yea, as renderhim "*worthy* of election," and of the "mediation of Jeſus Chriſt[v]." When therefore it is affirmed "that he *cannot* turn, &c. himſelf, without the Grace of God by Chriſt, &c." it may only mean, it is inſinuated, that it is not probable that he

---

(r) Ibid. Ser. 1. p. 18, 19. (z) Antical. p. 15, 16. (s) See Mr. Ludlam's ſix Eſſays, p. 92, 97, 101, 82; and four Eſſays, p. 79, 81, 27, 32; and paſſim; and Biſhop Warburton on Grace, p. 112, quoted with approbation by Mr. Clapham; and p. 39, 96, compared with Andrews on Grace, p. 112—117; and Benſon's ninth Sermon, p. 185. (t) See Dr. Croft's Thoughts, &c. p. 22; Dr. Carr's Sermons, p. 134. Mr. Daubeny's Guide, Diſc. 5th, and paſſim; &c. &c. (v) See Note r; and Mr. Clapham's Thankſgiving Sermon, 97, p. 23, 24; and Mr. Haggitt, p. 7; and Benſon's Ser. 1. p. 8, 13, 19, &c.

will, and that "in each inſtance" he *can;* that "no power" means only not what is quite *ſufficient;* and in ſhort, that he can, by his own natural ſtrength, do every thing but place himſelf "in a ſtate of Chriſtian perfection [w]."

Upon the whole then, we have, it muſt be allowed, the firmeſt ground for concluding, that, as Mr. Locke is ſaid to have done in reſpect to the Doctrines of Chriſtianity in general [x], theſe Divines "ſet themſelves to reduce this doctrine to the narroweſt compaſs they poſſibly can."——This indeed ſome of them confeſs. The general idea, they ſay, is, that we did not differ from the Romaniſts upon it [y]. Dr. Balguy would not lay much ſtreſs upon it [z]. Biſhop Watſon defends only the *Deiſt's* notion of it [a]. Dr. Hey appears joyful in finding "how near to Taylor, the moſt eminent of the Socinians," he has reduced it [b].

3. Let us now then examine WHAT OUR CHURCH teaches on the ſubject. It is ſtill our queſtion, it will be remembered, whoſe ſentiments are thoſe which ſhe holds, and which her Reformers taught? It will be remembered too, that ſhe is undoubtedly to be underſtood according to the moſt full and obvious ſenſe of her words.

We will begin with her Article which is expreſsly on the doctrine. And here ſhe ſpeaks thus: "Original, or birth-ſin [c] ... is the fault and corruption of the nature of

---

(w) See Nor. Lect. Vol. 3. p. 219—225. (x) Biſhop Gibſon's 3d Paſtoral Letter, p. 231. (y) Nor. Lect. Vol. 3. p 145. (z) See above, p. 131. (a) See his Sermons and Charge, p. 68 (b) Nor. Lect. Vol. 3. p. 173, 190, 165.

(c) "Still," Biſhop Butler, treating on the 'Redemption of the World by the appointment of a Mediator,' obſerves, "it may be thought, that this whole manner of treating the ſubject before us, ſuppoſes *mankind to be naturally in a very ſtrange ſtate.* And truly ſo it does. But it is not Chriſtianity, which has put us into this ſtate. Whoever will conſider the manifold miſeries, and the extreme wicked-

every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far (quam longiſſime) gone from original righteouſneſs, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, ſo that the fleſh luſteth always contrary to the ſpirit."——In her baptiſmal ſervice, ſhe affirms, "that all men are conceived and born in ſin;" in her catechiſm, that we are "by nature born in ſin;" and in both, aſſerts the abſolute neceſſity of a new birth in order to ſalvation. She cauſes the moſt virtuous of her worſhippers to confeſs, that "there is no health in them;" that they are "miſerable offenders;" and to implore mercy after the repetition of every one of the ten commandments. Her communicants "acknowledge and bewail their manifold ſins and wickedneſs, which, from time to time, they moſt grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, againſt God's Divine Majeſty."

But what is the "wholeſome and godly doctrine" of her Homilies on the ſubject? Theſe diſcourſes were compoſed

---

neſs of the world: that the beſt have great wrongneſſes within themſelves, which they complain of, and endeavour to amend; but that the generality grow more profligate and corrupt with age: that heathen moraliſts thought the preſent ſtate to be a ſtate of puniſhment: and what might be added, that the earth our habitation has the appearances of being a ruin: whoever, I ſay, will conſider all theſe, and ſome other obvious things, will think he has little reaſon to object againſt the Scripture account, that *mankind is in a ſtate of degradation*; againſt this being the fact: how difficult ſoever he may think it to account for, or even to form a diſtinct conception of the occaſions and circumſtances of is. But that *the crime of our firſt parents* was the occaſion of our being placed in a more diſadvantageous condition, is a thing *thoroughly and particularly analogous to what we ſee, in the daily courſe of natural providence*." Anal. p. 2. C. 5. §. 5.——We will preſume to add, that whoever conſiders the *whole* evidence of Scripture on this doctrine, will ſee little reaſon to reject the notions of our Church upon it. This however, does not concern the queſtion with our opponents. But ſee Chap. 8. below.

chiefly by the two leading Agents in the eſtabliſhment of our Church, Archbiſhop Cranmer, and Biſhop Jewel [c]; and were extolled by all the eminent Reformers [d]. They are ſubſcribed with the Articles [e]. They have recently been extolled by a great modern Prelate [f], and by other eminent Divines [g], and are equally appealed to, with the Articles and Liturgy, by our opponents themſelves [z]. Their evidence therefore muſt be moſt concluſive. And this is ſuch as the following. "Of ourſelves, and by ourſelves, we have *no* goodneſs, help, or ſalvation; but contrariwiſe ſin, damnation, and death everlaſting." ... "Into this miſerable captivity, we were caſt, through the envy of the devil, by breaking of God's commandment in our firſt parent Adam [h]." Again, "Man of his own nature is fleſhly and carnal, corrupt and nought, ſinful and diſobedient to God, without any ſpark of goodneſs in him, without any virtuous or godly motion, only given to evil thoughts and wicked deeds [i]." And again, "All the life of them that lack the true faith is ſin [k]."—And, to add but one paſſage more, where whole diſcourſes might be produced to the ſame effect.——In the ſermon on the Nativity, after deſcribing the perfection in which man was created, and then giving the plain ſcripture account of the tranſgreſſion of Adam, the homily proceeds; "Whereby it came to paſs, that as before he was bleſſed, ſo now he was accurſed; as before he was loved, ſo now he was abhorred; as before he was moſt

---

(c) See Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 149; Biſhop Burnet's Preface to Expoſition of the Arts, p. 3; and Biſhop Pretyman's Elements, &c. Vol. 2. p. 535. (d) See Strype's Eccles. Mem. p. 31, 32, 307. (e) See Art. 11th, and 35th. (f) Biſhop Horſley, Ch. p. 28. (g) See the Antijacobin Review for October, 1798, p. 402. (z) See above, p. 12. (h) Hom. on the miſery of man, p. 10. (i) For Whitſunday, p. 292. (k) On good Works, p. 28.

beautiful and precious, ſo now he was moſt vile and wretched in the ſight of his Lord and Maker: Inſtead of the image of God, he was now become the image of the devil; inſtead of the citizen of heaven, he was become the bondſlave of hell, having in himſelf no one part of his former purity and cleanneſs, but being altogether ſpotted and defiled; inſomuch that now he ſeemed to be nothing elſe but a lump of ſin, and therefore by the juſt judgment of God, was condemned to everlaſting death.

This ſo great and miſerable a plague fell not only on Adam but alſo on his poſterity and children for ever, ſo that the whole brood of Adam's fleſh ſhould ſuſtain the ſelf ſame fall and puniſhment which their forefather by his offence moſt juſtly had deſerved. St. Paul in the fifth chapter to the Romans ſaith, By the offence of only Adam, the fault came upon all men to condemnation, and by one man's diſobedience many were made ſinners. By which words we are taught, that as in Adam all men univerſally ſinned, ſo in Adam all men univerſally received the reward of ſin; that is to ſay, became mortal, and ſubject unto death, having in themſelves nothing but everlaſting damnation both of body and ſoul. They became, as David ſaith, *corrupt and abominable*, they went all out of the way, there was none that did good, no not one. O what a miſerable and woeful ſtate was this, that the ſin of one man ſhould *deſtroy and condemn all men*, that nothing in all the world might be looked for, but *only pangs of death and pains of hell*[l]."

The ſame is the language of her other public writings and confeſſions, whoſe evidence we have ſhown to be ſo exceedingly important[m]. Nowell's Catechiſm is very expreſs on the ſubject. "On eating the forbidden fruit," it ſays, "Adam immediately became ſubject to death: the Divine

(l) On the Nativity, p. 254. (m) Above, p. 59—68.

Image in which he was at firſt created was obliterated, and in the place of thoſe ornaments of wiſdom, ſtrength, holineſs, truth, and righteouſneſs with which God had endowed him, ſucceeded the moſt horrible peſtilence, blindneſs, impotence, impiety, vanity, and injuſtice; in which evils and miſeries he involved his whole poſterity[n]." Again, after affirming that Adam was the head and repreſentative of the whole race of men, it adds, "He therefore having loſt his original endowments, the whole human nature was left naked, helpleſs, and deſtitute of all good. And from him thus defiled, as from a corrupt root and ſtock, proceed corrupt branches, which again continually transfer their own polluted nature into their offspring. Hence the ſhortneſs and uncertainty of our preſent life, and all the infirmities of our bodies: Hence that horrible blindneſs of the underſtanding and depravity of the mind: Hence that diſtortion and diſorder of all the affections and deſires: Hence that ſeminary and vile ſource of all ſin, with which mankind is infected and annoyed, which is therefore properly called ORIGINAL SIN[o]."

The doctrine of Biſhop Jewell's Apology is, that "every perſon is born in ſin, and leadeth his life in ſin[p]." Mr. Rogers explains this corruption of the nature of every man, as extending to "all his powers; cauſing darkneſs in the mind, concupiſcence in the will, and rebellion againſt the law of God in the affections: the effects of which are actual ſins, an evil conſcience, the wrath of God, death, and eternal damnation[q]."——Even the Augſburgh confeſſion, which is reſorted to as a palliative, uſes ſuch language as this: "Item docent, quod poſt lapſum Adæ, omnes homines ſecundum naturam propagati, naſcantur cum peccato, hoc eſt, ſine metu Dei, ſine fiducia erga Deum, & cum concupiſcentia, quodque hic morbus, ſeu vitium originis verè ſit peccatum,

(n) See Biſhop of Cheſter's Edit. p. 57. (o) Ibid. p. 58, 59.
(p) Page 78. (q) Expo. Art, 9.

damnans and afferens nunc quoque æternam mortem, his qui non renaſcuntur per baptiſmum & Spiritum Sanctum[r]." "If," proceeds the judicious Hooker, "God ſhould make us an offer thus large; ſearch all the generations of men ſince the fall of our father Adam, find one man, that hath done one action, which hath paſſed from him pure, without any ſtain or blemiſh at all; and for that one man's only action, neither man nor angel ſhall feel the torments which are prepared for both, Do you think that this ranſom, to deliver men and angels, could be found to be among the ſons of men? The beſt things which we do, have ſomewhat in them to be pardoned. How then can we do any thing meritorious, or worthy to be rewarded[z]?"

And would we learn how thoſe excellent of the earth, our firſt Biſhops and Martyrs, ſpoke of human depravity when referring more immediately to themſelves, it was in ſuch a manner as the following. The eminently holy John Bradford, referring to his expected martyrdom, ſays, "I have moſt juſtly deſerved, not only this kind, but alſo all kinds of death, and that eternally, for mine hypocriſy, vain glory, uncleanneſs, ſelf-love, covetouſneſs, idleneſs, unthankfulneſs, and carnal profeſſing of God's holy goſpel. . . . I am, and always have been, a vile hypocrite and grievous ſinner[s]." Archbiſhop Cranmer complained, that his "ſins were many without number, and great above meaſure, even beyond what his tongue could expreſs;" and exclaimed, "O Father of heaven, O Son, &c. have mercy upon me a moſt wretched caitiff and miſerable ſinner[t]." Biſhop Hooper addreſſed God in this way: "Lord, I am hell, but thou art heaven; I am a ſink of ſin, but thou art a gracious God, and a merciful Redeemer. Have mercy therefore upon me a

(r) Article 2nd. See this Confeſſion apud Grotius, Opera, tom. 4; or the Harmony of Confeſſions, publiſhed in 1581, and in Engliſh in 1586. (z) Diſ. on Juſtifica. p. 21. (s) See Fox, p. 1811, 1839. (t) Ibid. p. 2065.

moſt miſerable and wretched offender [v]." Biſhop Latimer adds, "In no condition we ſhall know ourſelves or God, except we do utterly coufeſs ourſelves to be *mere vileneſs and corruption* [x]."

Such is the expreſs and undeniable doctrine of our church and her reformers reſpecting the *extent* of human depravity. We will dwell a moment longer on her notions of the *deſert and puniſhment* of ſin.

She proceeds then, on this part of the ſubject, in her 9th Article, thus: "Therefore in every perſon born into this world, it (original ſin) *deſerveth God's wrath and damnation.*" Her catechiſm teaches, that we are all, "by nature, children of wrath." Her 2nd Article affirms, that Chriſt ſuffered "to be a ſacrifice for *original guilt;*" and her 17th, that Predeſtination is the purpoſe of God "to deliver thoſe whom he hath choſen in Chriſt out of mankind from *curſe and damnation.*" Her communicants confeſs that they have provoked "moſt juſtly God's wrath and indignation againſt them." Her opinion with reſpect to the future deſtiny of unbelievers and evil-doers, is, that "without doubt they ſhall periſh everlaſtingly;" that "they ſhall go into everlaſting fire." This ſhe believes will be a "moſt juſt judgment." She prays, accordingly, for every child that ſhe baptizes, "that it may be delivered from God's wrath;" and for all her members, in her conſtant ſervices, implores deliverance "from God's wrath, and from everlaſting damnation," and from "the bitter pains of eternal death."

Equally forcible on the point, is the language of her Homilies. Their uniform doctrine accords with what has already been quoted from them [y]. "We are all," ſays the Homily on the Paſſion, "miſerable perſons, ſinful perſons, . . . juſtly driven out of paradiſe, juſtly excluded from heaven, juſtly condemned to hell-fire [z]." "We daily and

(v) Ibid. p. 1683. (x) Sermons, Vol. i. p. 908. (y) Above, p. 142—144. (z) Page 271.

hourly," adds the Homily on Repentance, "by our wickedneſs and ſtubborn diſobedience, horribly fall away from God, thereby purchaſing unto ourſelves, if he ſhould deal with us according to his juſtice, eternal damnation [a];" yea, "ſo grievouſly have we offended God by our ſins, that we deſerve a thouſand hells, if there could be ſo many [b]." "Such" theſe homilies alſo affirm, "is the filthineſs of ſin, that as long as we do abide in it, God cannot but deteſt and abhor us [c]." "And verily herein," they obſerve, "doth appear how filthy a thing ſin is, ſeeing that it can by no other means be waſhed away, but by the blood of the only begotten Son of God [d]." And the *death* which is denounced againſt diſobedience, they ſay, is "not only an *everlaſting* loſs without remedy of the grace and favour of God, and of everlaſting joy, pleaſure, and felicity; but alſo the *condemnation of both body and ſoul*, without either appellation, or hope of redemption, unto everlaſting pains in hell [e]."

Nor are theſe ſtrong expreſſions in the ſmalleſt degree reſtricted by any other public writing, or opinion, of the chief founders of our church. Preciſely the ſame, in effect, it has appeared [f], is the language of Rogers' Expoſition, the Augſburgh Confeſſion, and the Letters of Mr. Bradford. One quotation more ſhall therefore ſuffice on the point. This ſhall be from that confeſſedly important evidence Nowell's Catechiſm. And here, the queſtion being propoſed whether the bad effects of original ſin are confined to this life? it is anſwered, "Nay, ſo is our nature corrupted and depraved by this inbred evil, that unleſs the goodneſs and mercy of Almighty God had provided a remedy, as in our bodies we were ſubject to every kind of calamity, and diſeaſe, and death; ſo ſhould we neceſſarily have been caſt into the moſt excruciating and eternal torments, in unquenchable fire [g]."

(a) Page 334. (b) Ibid. p. 343. (c) Ibid. p. 349. (d) Ibid. (e) Hom. againſt the fear of death, p. 53. (f) Above p. 145, 146. (g) Page 59.

Can there then be a doubt what doctrine is taught by such strong, such uniform, such reiterated language as this? Is it possible that all this should only imply some small, or merely *temporal* punishment? Then surely words have no longer any intelligible meaning.

We have still to inquire, a little more particularly, what the church of England holds respecting man's *natural impotence*, or the powers he naturally possesses for recovering himself from this state of sin and misery.——On this point her 10th Article speaks thus: "The condition of man, after the fall of Adam, is such, that he *cannot* turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God: wherefore we have *no power* to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ PREVENTING us, that we may have a *good will*, and *working with* us, when we have that good will."

By "natural good works" is here, doubtless, meant, those works which are outwardly and speciously good, and which are estimable in human judgment. That he can perform *these* "civilem justitiam, et diligendas res rationi subjectas," as the *Augsburgh Confession* expresses it[h], nobody denies. The question is not what his powers are in respect to natural things, but in respect to spiritual things; not what he can do that may please men, but what that is pleasing and acceptable to God; not how far he can conform himself to the laws of civil society, but how far he can convert himself to true Christianity; how far by his own natural and unassisted powers he can repent, and believe, and love God and his neighbour, and mortify sin, and pursue holiness, in the manner, and from the motives, which the gospel requires. Nor is it a *natural* but a "*moral* impotence" which is the subject of our discussion.

In this article then, it is, we see, affirmed, not only that man cannot by his own natural strength and good works

(h) Art. 18.

convert himself to God, but that he cannot even *prepare* himself for this work, or, of course, take the *first step* in it. It is affirmed not merely that he is *weak*, and, in opposition to the Pelagian and Socinian, that he has need of divine and *internal assistance* in order to a right Christian conduct, and consequent salvation; but, in opposition to the Semipelagian, the Papist, and all who extol his innate faculties of reason and choice, in respect to divine things, that he has *no power* to do good; not the *disposition*, and consequently, not the *ability* to do what in the sight of God is good, till he is influenced by the Spirit of God. The grace of God by Christ, it is maintained, must *prevent* him, previously influence his mind, even that he may have a good-will.—Whoever else then may doubt, "which begins first, grace or virtue[1]?" our church we see does not.

And this sense of the article is confirmed by the whole tenour of her language on the point. In her 13th article she repeats the declaration, that "works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God;" and adds, "neither do they make men *meet* to receive grace," or in any way "*deserving* of it;" but "rather, for as much as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, and are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done," she "doubts not but they have the nature of sin."——To the same effect she every where speaks in her Liturgy. She confesses our condition is like that of a "lost sheep;" that "we are tied and bound with the chain of our sins;" that "through the weakness of our mortal nature we can do *no good thing* without God;" and, "that we have *no power of ourselves* to help ourselves." She constantly addresses God as "The author of all godliness;" "from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works, do proceed." She constantly petitions him, according to the very strain and spirit of the above article, for *preventing*

(i) See Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 240.

not leſs than *aſſiſting* grace, for both the *Will* and the *Power* to do what he requires; that, "as by his *eſpecial grace preventing* us, he puts into our minds good deſires, ſo by his *continual help* we may bring the ſame to good effect;" "that by his holy inſpiration we may *think* thoſe things that be good, and by his merciful *guiding* may perform the ſame;" that his "grace may always *prevent* and follow us;" that "by the help of his grace we may pleaſe him both in *will* and *deed*;" with numberleſs requeſts to the ſame effect, all which ſhe uniformly preſents "through Jeſus Chriſt[k]."

She prays too, (it becomes one claſs of our opponents to obſerve) for *knowledge* as well as ſtrength and a good-will; for "the knowledge of God's truth[l];" "that by the ſame ſpirit" which taught the hearts of God's faithful people on the day of Pentecoſt, her members may "have a *right judgment* in all things;" that they "may *perceive and know* what things they ought to do[m];" and that it may pleaſe God "to *illuminate* all her Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, with *true knowledge* and underſtanding of his word[n]." The very ſtrongeſt idea of man's natural impotence, in reſpect to his converſion, is alſo expreſſed in the repreſentations ſhe makes of it as a *creation*, a *regeneration*, and a *reſurrection*[o]. Theſe are excluſive acts of Deity.

This doctrine is alſo abundantly confirmed by the other public writings of the church. The Homily on Good Works affirms, that "they be as much *dead to God* that *lack faith*, as they be to the world, whoſe bodies lack ſouls." And the whole firſt part of this diſcourſe is profeſſedly to ſhow, that the "moſt gay and glorious" works which they can perform, who are not united to Chriſt by faith, are

(k) See the General Confeſſion; Prayer in Ordinary Service; Collects for, 1ſt Sunday after Trin. 2d Sun. after Lent, 23d after Trin. 2d at Evening prayer, Eaſter day, 5th after Eaſter, 17th after Trin. 1ſt after Trin. (l) Daily Service. (m) Collects for Whitſun, 1ſt Sunday after Epiphany. (n) Litany. (o) See Collect for Aſh Wed. Baptiſmal and Funeral Service.

"but *dead*, *vain*, and *fruitleſs*, before God;" that they are the mere "names and ſhadows" of good works; and that in reality, when tried by the true ſtandard, what under ſuch circumſtances, "ſeemeth to be virtue, is vice." And every where, the homilies abound with language like this: "St. Paul in many places painteth us out in our colours, calling us the children of the wrath of God, when we be born: ſaying alſo that we cannot think a good thought of ourſelves, much leſs can we ſay well, or do well of ourſelves[p]." "Man cannot make himſelf righteous by his own works, neither in part, nor in the whole[q]." "If we have any will to riſe (from ſin) it is HE (God) that *preventeth* our will, and diſpoſeth us thereto[r]." "They that think they have done much of themſelves towards repentance, are ſo much more the farther from God[s]." "We muſt beware and take heed that we do in nowiſe think in our hearts, imagine, or believe, that we are able to repent aright, or to turn effectually unto the Lord, by our own might and ſtrength. For this muſt be verified in all men, "Without me ye can do nothing." Again, "Of ourſelves we are not able ſo much as to think a good thought." And in another place, "It is God that worketh in us both the *will* and the *deed*[t]."

So in reſpect to our powers for acquiring all neceſſary *knowledge* in Divine things. "No man," the church here ſays to God, "can know thy pleaſure, except thou giveſt wiſdom, and ſendeſt thy Holy Spirit from above[v]." Again, ſhe ſaith, with St. Chryſoſtom, "Man's human and worldly wiſdom or ſcience, is not needful to the underſtanding of ſcripture, but the revelation of the Holy Ghoſt, who inſpireth the true meaning into them, who with humility and diligence ſearch for it.[w]" And again, after quoting ſeveral

---

(p) On the Miſery of Man, p. 8. (q) On Salvation, p. 15.
(r) Third for Rogation Week, p. 309. (s) On Repentance, p. 337. (t) Ibid. p. 341. (v) Third on Rogation, p. 310.
(w) On the knowledge of Scrip. 2nd, p. 5.

precepts of God's word, ſhe ſays, "Theſe ſentences, good people, unto a natural man ſeem mere abſurdities, contrary to all reaſon. For a natural man, as St. Paul ſaith, underſtandeth not the things that belong to God, neither can he ſo long as the old Adam dwelleth in him[x]."

Dean Nowell denominates this part of our malady, "the moſt horrible blindneſs and impotence;" and affirms expreſsly, "that we cannot by any works or merits *prevent* God, and firſt move him to be propitious to us[y]." The Augſburgh Confeſſion ſays, "Humana voluntas non habet vim ſine Spiritu Sancto efficiendæ juſtitiæ Dei ſeu juſtitiæ ſpiritualis: quid animalis homo non percipit ea, quæ ſunt Spiritus Dei[z]." And to finiſh with one evidence more on the point; the common belief of the leading Reformers in King Edward's time was, "that the Papiſtical doctrine of freewill was abominable in the ſight of God, and to be abhorred by all Chriſtian men: . . . that Adam by his fall loſt from himſelf, and all his poſterity, all the freedom, choice, and power of man's will to do good:" . . . that in conſequence, "all the will and imagination of man's heart is only to evil, and altogether ſubject to ſin and miſery, and bond and captive to all manner of wickedneſs, ſo that it cannot once think a good thought, much leſs then do any good deed, as of his own work, pleaſant and acceptable in the ſight of God, until ſuch time as the ſame be regenerate by the Holy Ghoſt, and *prevented* by the grace of God:——That without this his good Spirit, which doth work faith in us, all our doings be very ſin and hypocriſy in the ſight of God, how gay and glorious ſoever they may appear in the ſight of man: That the natural man is dead in Adam, and a child of wrath; and that as a dead man cannot work any thing towards his reſurrection, or he that *is not* toward his creation, ſo neither can the natural man toward his regeneration," this being "only the work of God[a]".

(x) On certain places of Scripture, 2nd, 237. (y) Cat. p. 57, 113. (z) Art. 18. (a) See above, p. 61. Note m.

This then, upon the whole, is the manner in which the doctrine and effects of original sin are taught in the Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies, of the Church of England. To *this extent* is her meaning in these forms fixed and illustrated, by the other public writings of her principal Reformers.

4. And now, *whose* doctrines most resemble hers? *Ours* who speak strongly on the subject; or *theirs*, who so labour to lower and extenuate it? We appeal to every person of common sense and common integrity to say.——Is it possible for those Divines, who treat this doctrine in the manner which has been specified, to believe that they agree with the Church upon it?——On some occasions they pretty nearly confess that it is not. Bishop Burnet, for instance, admits, that the *higher* or *Augustinian* explication of the 9th Article, which differs from his own, "does certainly quadrate more entirely to the words of the article, and is known to have been the tenet of those who prepared the articles." "This," he says, "those who oppose it, do not deny[b]." And, "No doubt," adds Professor Hey, "he would most fully agree with our church, who considered the fall of Adam as the first beginning of our depravity[c]." Nor will he "say, that if any one thought that man cannot possibly, in the strict sense, turn and prepare himself to faith, he would dissent from our article[d]:" Both which opinions differ exceedingly from the interpretation which the Professor would establish.

This difference is also obvious from the *concessions* he would make, and the *alterations* he suggests, in the articles on this doctrine[e]. And he "knows not," he also acknowledges, "whether the expressions on the present subject" in our Homilies, "are not *somewhat too strong for him*, though they may be chiefly borrowed from Chrysostom and Augustin[f]."

(b) Expo. Art. 9. p. 114, 116. (c) Vol. iii. p. 219. (d) Ibid. p. 220. (e) Ibid. p. 189, 227, 256. (f) Ibid. p. 375.

Similar conceſſions, in abundance, might be adduced from others of the moſt eminent of this claſs of teachers. And that any of them ſhould attempt to maintain their agreement with the church on this doctrine is really aſtoniſhing. For, let us only bring a few leading ideas of each into compariſon and ſee how this coincidence will appear.

They then, it has been ſhown, deny the corruption of our nature by the fall *altogether;* doubt whether our mental corruption is *at all* owing to Adam's tranſgreſſion; or confine this corruption to *ſome* of our ſpecies: Our church, in terms the moſt expreſs and unequivocal, which ſhe repeats and illuſtrates beyond all poſſible room for miſtaking her, aſſerts, that "Original ſin, is the fault and corruption of the nature of *every man* that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam;" that "*All* men are conceived and born in ſin;" that into this ſtate "we were caſt by breaking of God's commandment *in our firſt parent Adam;* and that we deſcend from him as corrupt branches from a corrupt ſtock.——The moſt orthodox of theſe Divines conſider this depravity of our nature as but *partial;* as conſiſting in defects and imperfections accompanied with much remaining good:——Our church teaches, that we are the *fartheſt poſſible* gone from original righteouſneſs; that we have no health in us, no one part of our former purity and cleanneſs; that of our own nature we are without any ſpark of goodneſs in us, without any virtuous or godly motion, and only given to evil thoughts and wicked deeds.

In their judgment, the great evil of ſin conſiſts in its effects on human ſociety:——Our church affirms, that it moſt juſtly provokes the wrath and indignation of God.——A common opinion with them is, that the effects of the firſt tranſgreſſion upon Adam's poſterity are only *temporal* judgments, and a ſtate of *mortality*:——The church of England aſſerts, that in every child who is born into the world original ſin deſerveth God's wrath and damnation; that Adam after his fall was accurſed of his Maker, condemned by his

juſt judgment to everlaſting death; that he had nothing in himſelf but everlaſting condemnation both of body and ſoul, and that his whole poſterity, ſuſtain the ſelf-ſame fall and puniſhment.——According to their caſuiſtry, God's moſt awful denunciations againſt ſin may only imply ſome ſmall, indeterminate, and uncertain kind of puniſhment: Theſe denunciations they are always ſhy of mentioning: And they even ſay, that "We are not called upon by our church to ſubſcribe to the eternity of hell-torments, nor even to condemn thoſe who affirm that all men will be finally ſaved:"—Our church uſes, and conſtantly repeats, in regard both to the intenſity and duration of this puniſhment, the very ſtrongeſt expreſſions afforded in language: Such ſurely are theſe, to "periſh everlaſtingly;" "to go into everlaſting fire;" "God's wrath and everlaſting damnation;" "the bitter pains of eternal death;" "hell-fire;" "the moſt excruciating and eternal torments in unquenchable fire [g]."——How would theſe Gentlemen repreſent intenſe and never-ending miſery, if this language does not?

So in reſpect to the *powers* man naturally poſſeſſes for reſtoring himſelf to holineſs and the divine favour. They mightily extol his *reaſon* as ſufficient, without any ſupernatural aſſiſtance, to enter into the true meaning of God's word, and to attain all requiſite knowledge in divine things: Our church teaches, that "unto a *natural* man, many of the precepts of God's word, ſeem mere *abſurdities*, contrary to all reaſon;" and that "a natural man underſtandeth not the things that belong to God, and that neither can he."—They teach, with almoſt one voice, like the Papiſts, the doctrine of *freewill*:—Our Reformers ſay, that the Papiſtical doctrine of freewill is *abominable* in the ſight of God, and to *be abhorred* by all Chriſtian men; and our church adds, that we have no will to good till we are *prevented* by the grace of Chriſt.——Their ideas are, that man's natural powers are only *not quite ſufficient* for what Chriſtianity re-

(g) See above, p. 143—148.

quires; that they cannot place him in a ſtate of Chriſtian *perfection*, but that he can atchieve a *great deal* toward this end; and that *ſomething* muſt be *firſt done by him*, in the work of converſion and ſalvation, is moſt ſtrenuouſly inſiſted upon. Sometimes they ſuppoſe him capable of performing ſuch good works as naturally make him *inclined* to embrace the goſpel; at others, ſuch as may *recommend* him to God; and at others, ſuch as *render him worthy* of the Divine favour and election: Our church teaches, that he has *no power* to do what is really good; that without Chriſt he *can do nothing* in the work of his ſalvation; that of himſelf he is unable even to think a good thought; that he cannot make himſelf righteous either in the whole or in part; that he cannot even *prepare himſelf* to faith, &c.; that his *beſt* natural works neither render him *meet* to receive grace, nor *deſerving* of it, nor are *pleaſing* to God, but are, in fact, *themſelves ſins*.

This then is the agreement with our Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies, of which theſe Churchmen boaſt! In this manner do they teach the doctrines contained in theſe formularies as they were firſt delivered by our Reformers!

But there is another aſſertion in the propoſition under diſcuſſion equally well grounded. *We*, they ſay, "*teach* MORE than theſe doctrines [h]."

We anſwer then in reſpect to the preſent ſubject, Is the thing *poſſible?* Is it poſſible to uſe ſtronger language upon it than what has been produced from the authentic writings of the church, and her chief founders? We *can* only teach that every man who is born, conſidered independent of the grace of God, and in reſpect to ſpiritual concerns, is wholly corrupt, utterly impotent, under the wrath of God, and liable to everlaſting torments; all which in the very fulleſt manner is done here. This charge, how-

(h) See above, p. 13.

ever, it will be remembered, includes thoſe who only proceed *Arminian* lengths[i]. It ſhall be admitted that the language of the church which has been adduced is popular; that the paſſages have been ſelected from other language which appears to qualify and ſoften them; and that ſome of them are the exaggerated expreſſions of penitence. But who needs reminding, that whatever allowances may, and ought, to be made on theſe, and ſuch like, conſiderations, are equally applicable to what is quoted from *our* writers? But by what evidence is the accuſation ſupported? From what part of a late popular Work[k], againſt which it is made with ſo much confidence, can a ſingle ſhadow of this evidence be produced? We hear much of its "ſuperabundance of orthodoxy[l];" of its "going beyond the creed of the church of England[m];" of its "tendency to a particular ſpecies of enthuſiaſm[n];" "of its "bias toward a fanatical ſect[o];" and of certain parts of it being "more favourable to *enthuſiaſm* than to practical Chriſtianity[p]:" In what part of it then, we aſk, is there a ſingle ſentence or expreſſion that exceeds the language of the church on the preſent ſubject? We defy the united body of theſe divines and critics to ſhow: We defy Mr. Ludlam to ſhow any ſuch exceſs in the immediate ſubjects of his attack, the "Scripture Characters," and the Works of Mr. Milner. We defy Dr. Croft, Dr. Paley, Mr. Daubeny, Mr. Polwhele, and the whole hoſt of our opponents to ſubſtantiate their charge in reſpect to this doctrine, from the Works of any Author within the limits of our apology.

Is it not then, ſo far, pretty clear to whom the charge of "groſs miſrepreſentation" belongs? Nay, were *that* com-

---

(i) Above, p. 97. (k) Mr. Wilberforce's Practical View. (l) Critical Review of ditto, June, 1797. (m) Ibid. Review of Wakefield's anſwer. (n) Britiſh Critic for September, 1797. (o) Ibid. (p) Daubeny's Guide, p. 313.

patible with the doctrines of our church, might we not almoſt be indignant at theſe Gentlemen? How can they come forward, in the character of divines, to criminate *others* who are *innocent*, upon the *very points* in which they are ſo *notoriouſly guilty themſelves?* If this has not been proved with regard to the preſent doctrine, how ſhall we be able to prove any thing? And if it has, it will be eaſy to prove the ſame concerning any other fundamental doctrine of the church; they will all neceſſarily take their different complexions according to our different ideas here.

CHAP. V.

The inveſtigation continued with reſpect to the doctrine of REPENTANCE.

OUR next particular examination of theſe different claims of adherence to the genuine tenets of the Church of England ſhall reſpect the important doctrine of REPENTANCE. It is indeed an obvious conſequence, that the difference of opinion on this head will be proportionable to that on the preceding doctrine. In proportion to men's ideas of the extent, the evil nature, and evil conſequences, of their depravity, will, of courſe, be their ſolicitude reſpecting it, and their notions of converſion from it. A few particulars ſhall however be noticed relating to this point.

OUR ideas then are, that a *feeling* and *practical* conviction of human depravity is eſſential in Chriſtianity. This conviction, we think, may juſtly excite unfeigned ſorrow, and deep anxiety in the ſoul. And, it is our opinion, that in order to ſalvation, a *change of mind*, of views and diſpoſition, muſt be effected in *every perſon*, wherever born, however educated, or of whatever external conduct. Is it ſaid, this change is effected in us at our *baptiſm?* We anſwer; have you then indeed kept your baptiſmal vow? Have you in the uniform and habitual tenour of your life been "renouncing ſin, the world, and the Devil; following the example of our Saviour Chriſt; and daily becoming more like unto him?" Have you indeed experienced the inward and ſpiritual grace, of which "the waſhing of water" is the external emblem, "a death unto ſin, and a

new birth unto righteouſneſs[a]?" And, are your views, tempers, and purſuits indeed ſuch, as in ſcripture every where characterize the *regenerate* children of God[b]?

If ſo, it is well: But if not; remember, we add, the Apoſtle's reaſoning reſpecting circumciſion, that "if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumciſion is made uncircumciſion[c]:" See the account he gives of the utter inefficacy of that perſon's religion who was only "a Jew outwardly[d];" Hear him affirm, that "In Chriſt Jeſus neither circumciſion availeth any thing, nor uncircumciſion, but a new creature[e]." Conſider alſo, we proceed, upon what high authority it is declared, that "if the root is made holy, the branches will be holy[f];" that "a good tree CANNOT bring forth evil fruit," but that "evil fruit" is a certain proof of "a corrupt tree;" and that an evil conduct can only proceed from an "evil heart[g]:" Compare all this, with the conduct of the bulk of thoſe who have been baptized, and then ſay whether they have not, in the ſcripture ſenſe of the words, *evil and corrupt hearts*; whether many of them are any more than Chriſtians "outwardly;" for, that ſuch perſons live in the habitual practice of what the word of God deems evil, it is impoſſible to deny.

This diſtinction between a mere nominal, hereditary, external religion, and real, practical, internal Chriſtianity; between the mere *form of Godlineſs*, and the *power* of it, we cannot relinquiſh. All therefore who poſſeſs only the former, have need, we apprehend, to *lay anew the very foundation* of the doctrine of Chriſt[h]. Such perſons we therefore exhort in the language of ſcripture, to "repent and be converted[i];" to "make the tree good" in order that the fruit may be good.

(a) See our Baptiſmal Service, and Catechiſm. (b) See amongſt other ſcriptures, 1 John, Chapters iii, v.; Rom. viii. Gal. v.
(c) Rom. ii. 25. (d) Ibid. ver. 25—29. (e) Gal. vi. 15.
(f) Rom. xi. 16. (g) See Matt. vii. 17—19; xii. 33—35; Luke vi. 44, 45.
(h) See Heb. vi. 1; and v. 12.
(i) Acts iii. 19.

This change, we conceive, is fitly repreſented not only by the term repentance, but alſo by thoſe of converſion, renovation, ſpiritual reſurrection, circumciſion of the heart, and every ſimilar phraſe and metaphor of ſcripture, which are uſed in reſpect to the firſt converts to Chriſtianity. All theſe phraſes and expreſſions, as Mr. Edwards has proved [k], unqueſtionably relate to the ſame change, and are generally of much the ſame import. We are not, as ſome perſons would inſinuate [z], ſo abſurd as to undertake to convert perſons already called Chriſtians to the *profeſſion* of Chriſtianity, as the Apoſtles converted the Jews and Heathens. Our object is, the converſion of this hereditary profeſſion into actual practice and experience. And in fact, the change effected in the views, diſpoſitions, and purſuits of thoſe who from mere *nominal* become *real* Chriſtians, bears ſo ſtrong a reſemblance to that experienced by the firſt Chriſtians on their converſion, as fully to juſtify the deſcription of it by the ſame terms.

Men may however denominate it what they pleaſe; we are not here ſolicitous about words; it is the *thing* only, the actual reformation of the heart and character, which we deem of importance. But, comparing the general ſtate of religion around us with genuine Chriſtianity; obſerving the rapid "growth of heatheniſm among modern Chriſtians [y];" learning, from authority the moſt reſpectable, that "the characteriſtics of the preſent times are, confeſſedly, Infidelity, and an unprecedented Indifference to the Religion of Chriſt, among profeſſed believers;" that "not *one-third* part of the inhabitants" ordinarily attend "on divine ſervice" in the Church, and "not *one-ſixth* part of the adults" at the communion, through "a great

(k) See Edwards on Orig. Sin, p. 346—360. (z) See Mr. Haggitt's Sermon, p. 12. (y) See "The Scholar Armed againſt the Errors of the Time, Vol. 2. p. 269—285.

part of the kingdom;" and of these, that "it is to be feared," that merely "*nominal* Christians make up a great part of many congregations[x]," this kind of conversion, we apprehend, should form one leading object of the faithful minister's attention. The "poison" then against which we are so anxious to guard, is, the ABUSE of an established doctrine in regard to this subject; the permitting all persons in our communion who have been baptized to expect the blessings of the baptismal covenant as a matter "of course," whether or not they "may lead the rest of their life according to that beginning," whether or not in any sober sense of the words they fulfil the conditions of this covenant. In our judgment, those teachers, who, by attending only to *one side* of this engagement, represent *all* the *professed* members of our Church as "true believers," "true Christians," of the "true Church of Christ," "separated from the world," "partakers of an holy life," and "in the sure road to heaven," do violence to common fact and common sense, run counter to the whole tenour of scripture, and are "in the sure road" to ruin the establishment.

The author of this happy change of character, we believe, is, the Holy Spirit; but, that it is generally effected, and is always to be sought after, in the diligent use of the appointed means of grace.——Neither let it be insinuated, that when we speak of this conversion, repentance, or whatever else it is called, we are ranting about some instantaneous operation which finishes the whole business of religion at once: We mean by it the *serious commencement* of a work which it requires the vigorous exertions of the whole life to complete.——Our opinion therefore also further is, that humility of mind, and seriousness of deport-

(x) See the Bishop of Lincoln's Ch. 1800, p. 10, 13, 18; and the Report of the Lincolnshire Clergy, p. 6.; and below at the conclusion.

ment, highly become the character of Chriſtians in their beſt eſtate.—And, if indeed, like our guilty firſt parent, we have any perception of our fallen condition, any ſenſe of our revolt from God, and of the "Evils which our own miſdeeds have wrought,"

> "What better can we do, than proſtrate fall
> Before him reverent, and there confeſs
> Humbly our faults, and pardon beg, with tears
> Watering the ground, and with our ſighs the air
> Frequenting, ſent from hearts contrite, in ſign
> Of ſorrow unfeigned, and humilation meek[l]."

2 Very different, however, are the notions of ſeveral of our *Opponents*. We will not affirm that they abſolutely treat with ridicule every appearance of contrition for ſin, or ſolicitude reſpecting the ſtate of the ſoul; but they certainly approach very near ſuch a conduct. At the moſt, it is only ſome gentle feeling of remorſe, ſome ſlight degree of ſpiritual anxiety, which they can endure. Men may be ſerious, may be affected, may diſcover ſolicitude, about what other objects they pleaſe; it is not permitted here: It is knavery; it is folly; it is hypocriſy; it is inſanity, where the honour of God and the care of the ſoul are concerned

Thus, Mr. Polwhele reckons it among the undeniable proofs of Dr. Hawker's fanaticiſm, that he "congratulates his pariſhioner on his feeling himſelf to be a poor ſinner; on being ſenſible of the burden of his ſins[m]:" that he repreſents him as having "diſcovered, that his fancied righteouſneſs before God is full of unworthineſs; and that even in his moſt holy things, he is unholy:" . . . . that "on the principle of original depravity, he laments, in a general obſcure manner, the bias of his nature to ſin, and cries out, 'that in his fleſh there dwelleth no good thing[n]:"

(l) See Paradiſe Loſt, B. 10. (m) Letter, p. 43.
(n) Ibid. p. 39.

that his Chriſtian, "as ſoon as he feels the awakening word, goes groaning all the day long under the ſenſe of tranſgreſſion; under the myſterious apprehenſion of impending judgment, he is all anxiety and terror [o]." Mr. P. alſo mentions it among the deplorable extravagancies, which he ſays are at this moment taking place "through almoſt all the towns and villages in Cornwall," that perſons are "proſtrate in the duſt, and bewailing their ſins [p]." And who will ſay that this very ſerious ſubject is not abſolutely ſported with, in the following paſſage? "Virgins," ſays Mr. P., "indeed innocent and unſuſpecting, have received repeated leſſons from their ſpiritual inſtructors; till, at length, ſenſible of the burthen of their ſins, they have dropped the tears of contrition [q]!" "We need not," he ſays again after Dr. Ibbot, "diſquiet ourſelves, or diſtruſt our own ſtate, becauſe no ſtrange thing has happened unto us, becauſe we have not been terrified, nor felt any violent inward pangs and convulſions. For religion is eaſy and natural, pleaſant and delightful, unleſs we have made it otherwiſe by contrary habits: and even then we may be reconciled to it, without any of this unnatural dread or

(o) Ibid. p. 56. (p) Ibid. p. 81. (q) Ibid. 79.

We have ſeen this Gentleman, and his companions, in this ſporting humour before: above, Chap. 3. p. 123. It ſeems natural to them. But do they really expect to promote the cauſe of true religion by theſe means? How different was the opinion of Lord Bacon. "To turn religion into comedy," this prodigy of wiſdom obſerves, "to ſearch and rip up wounds with a laughing countenance; to intermix ſcripture and ſcurrility ſometimes in one ſentence, is a thing far from the reverence of a Chriſtian, and ſcant beſeeming the honeſt regard of a ſober man. Non eſt major confuſio quam ſerii et joci: the majeſty of religion and the contempt and deformity of things ridiculous are things as diſtant as things may be. Two principal cauſes have I ever known of Atheiſm, curious controverſies and prophane ſcoffing." Works, Vol. 4. p. 460.

concern[r]." Accordingly, when an unquestionably pious man laments "becauſe he could not do any thing with a ſingle intention;" Mr. P.'s comment is, "i. e. was a hypocrite[s];" and thus does he invariably treat ſimilar confeſſions of ſin[t]. Yet, according to this rule of judgment, Cranmer, Hooper, Latimer, and their Colleagues muſt have been the vileſt wretches upon earth[v]. But did Mr. P. never read of an Apoſtle who "was alive without the law," but who died the moment he underſtood the commandment in its true extent and ſpirituality; who, although before he had conſidered himſelf as touching the law blameleſs, now confeſſed himſelf the chief of ſinners; and, who groaned under a ſenſe of guilt and corruption even when he was a faithful preacher of the goſpel[w]? Did he never read the ſtrong penitential language of the upright and perfect Job, on the true diſcovery of his character before God[x]? It has before appeared[z] how this divine lends his countenance to that "modiſh curtailment of the Chriſtian faith," which ridicules all ſerious apprehenſions reſpecting that once renown'd enemy of man's ſalvation, the Devil.

Thus, "*in the name of* his *clerical brethern*[m]" does Mr. Polwhele treat on this ſubject. And theſe ſentiments, he informs us, are "*but an echo to diſcourſes from all the pulpits around* him[n]." They muſt, however, be conſidered as the ſentiments of the Reviewers, who have extolled his work as "not more remarkable for its ſtrength than its juſtice," who "ſtrenouſly recommend it to the peruſal of our regular clergy," and "wiſh Mr. P. to treat the ſubject more at large[a]."

(r) Letter, p. 15. (s) Ibid. p. 30. (t) See ibid. p. 62, 63. and paſſim. (v) See above, p. 145, and Fox paſſim. (w) See Rom. vii. & viii.; and 1 Tim. i. 15. (y) See Chap. xl. 4; xlii. 5, 6. (z) Above, p. 123. (m) Letter, p. 60. (n) Second Letter, p. 24.

(a) See the Antijac. Rev. for Aug. 1799, p. 452; and for Sept. 1799, p. 100.—Should it be ſuggeſted that theſe may be only Mr. Pol-

Similar alſo are the notions of Dr. Croft. Thus, ſpeaking of the teachers under his cenſure, he tauntingly ſays, "They triumph in the tears, convulſions, and agitations of many of their hearers. Satan is ſuppoſed to be loſing ground daily, and by a ſingular confuſion of compariſon, the regenerate, while acquiring the condition of new born babes, ſuffer all the pangs of parturition, not figuratively but literally [b]." On another occaſion, Dr. C. deſcribes thoſe who appear under ſerious ſpiritual concern, as "unhappy men, with downcaſt looks and ſad countenances," whoſe "health is gradually impaired," and whoſe "religion hath neither the promiſe of this life, nor of that which is to come [c]." "I diſlike cant," adds Mr Fellowes, "and all the gangrened ſperm and abortions of hypocriſy.... Religious cant is, of all the objects of deteſtation, the moſt deteſtable: and I am ſorry to have occaſion to remark that a miſerable, whining, driveling cant, ... hath been too much practiſed by ſeveral writers of the preſent day, from whom better things might have been expected. The fumes of fanaticiſm ſeem to have been exhaled and to be exhaling from thoſe in low to thoſe in high places." He then deſcribes the character of perſons holding Calviniſtic ſentiments, as marked by a "funeral aſpect, ... repulſive moroſeneſs, .. and acrimonious ſeverity, .. made more hideous and loathſome by deſponding ſhrugs, doleful ſighs, and hollow-ſounding groans [z]."

The ſubjects of Mr. Clapham's ſtrictures "labour," he ſays, "a certain period under the conviction of ſin, during which God requires to be ſought by deep ſighs, melancholy groans, unceaſing prayers [d]." And their doctrine, he would

---

whele's encomiums on himſelf? Still we contend that this work becomes reſponſible by their inſertion. We are under infinite obligations to the Antijacobin Reviewers for our acquaintance with the myſteries of the reviewing art.

(b) Thoughts, p. 1, 2. (c) Bamp. Lect. p. 109, 110.
(z) Antical. p. 5. (d) Ser. at Boroughbridge, p. 24.

assure us, is the high road to despair and suicide[e]. His admired friend, the Author of the "Review, &c." whom he "would earnestly recommend[f]," is, if possible, a greater enemy of the disposition in question. "We daily," he says, "hear of people, after some pretended struggle and qualms of conscience, affect to give out that they have obtained deliverance from the devil, and are now assured of eternal happiness, and of consequence lay claim to all the privileges of the faithful[g]." In his judgment, a religion which excites these sensations, affects the brain, unhinges the reason, injures both body and soul, overspreads men with melancholy, and creates countenances only proper for the worshippers of the devil[h]. They are unanimous in condemning this "broken and contrite heart" as incompatible with what they call "innocent mirth, and innocent amusements;[i]" among which, as Dr. Croft informs us[k] they class the entertainments of the stage.

Let it not however be thought that this is, by any means, a just description of our doctrine. We defy these Gentlemen to show from the Writings of the Divines here vindicated, any stronger expressions on the subject than are most clearly warranted in scripture. And why do they represent *these* as a system of groaning, convulsions, and agitations; why do they make persons who only hold the doctrine to this *extent* responsible for the extravagancies of sectaries,

---

(e) Ibid. p. 21. (f) Ibid. p. 13. n.—This Author observes, "At this time several *Churches* are occupied by the Methodists." Hence it is evident that Mr. C. does not confine the term *Methodism* and his strictures upon it to the followers of Mr. Wesley, and to those of "Mr. Whitefield, who are generally called Calvinists," but extends them to some of the regular Clergy; otherwise these strictures would have been unnoticed in this publication, which does not undertake to apologize for Sectaries, or any of their peculiarities.

(g) Review, &c. p. 22. (h) See Ibid. p. 22—24; 30—32.

(i) See places already quoted. (k) Thoughts, p. 16, 17.

and fanatics, if they do not wish to burlesque and explode the doctrine itself[z]?

It will not, it is hoped, be here objected by these Divines, that on some occasions they represent our doctrines as most "flattering," "fascinating," and "consolatory doctrines[l];" promising every thing, and requiring almost nothing; easing the consciences of the most abandoned characters at a very trifling expense; opening a short, and cheap, and sure road to heaven for all descriptions of sinners, without the labour of repentance; permitting them to retain the same manners, the same tempers, and to gratify the same favourite dispositions[m]. This they certainly do; and this flattering nature of the doctrine ascribed to us they assign as a principal cause of its extensive propagation[n]. We must, however, leave it to their own wisdom to reconcile this representation with the preceding one. It utterly exceeds our dulness to perceive how doctrines like these can drive men to despondency.

In the mean time, we may inquire, what their ideas are respecting the *change of character* implied in repentance? Now that any total or radical change is meant by this work, and necessary in these days; any thing that, in scripture phraseology, may be represented by the term conversion, or regeneration, or spiritual resurrection, or any language of this import, they deny expressly. Such phrases and expressions of scripture, it has appeared, they would assure us,

---

(z) How forcibly does all this remind one of the observation of Mr. Boyle. Some Ministers, this eminent man remarks, rather covet that their hearers "should applaud their Preacher, than condemn themselves; being better pleased with their praises than to hear their sighs; and chusing rather to tickle their ears, than to sting their consciences." "Such," however, he adds, "may invert St. Paul's saying, that he preaches not Christ crucified, but himself." Life, Theol. Works, Vol. 1. p. 117. (l) See Mr. Clapham's Ser. p. 24, 25, 27; and Review, &c. p. 14, 22. (m) Review, &c. p. 10—14, 16—27, &c. (n) See the two last Notes; and Mr. Haggitt's Sermon, Pref. p. 13.

"*mean nothing*" to thoſe who are born and educated in a Chriſtian country[o]. The ſuppoſition of the neceſſity of any ſuch change, as this, is wholly incompatible with their notions of the true Chriſtian ſtate of all who profeſs Chriſtianity, and with their rejection of experience in religion[p]. It is ſuppoſed therefore to have no exiſtence, but in the viſionary brains of enthuſiaſts. To inſiſt upon its neceſſity is, they ſay, to "repreſent the inhabitants of England as heathens in the age of the Apoſtles;" "and thoſe," it is added, whom theſe enthuſiaſts "affect to have *converted*, are ſaid to have turned from idols and vanities[q]." Thoſe who moſt ſoberly inculcate this doctrine, they alſo characterize as "bewildered men, who rant about ſudden converſions[r]." "If," ſays a dry nurſe of the Church, and profeſſed caterer to the taſte of the times, Theophilus St. John, "we ſhould ſay to our hearers, 'ye muſt be born again,' we ſhould ſpeak more to your fancy than your judgment[s]." "What!" adds Mr. Haggitt, with an air of great confidence and ſurpriſe, "*convert* to the Chriſtian faith thoſe who are already regenerate by baptiſm, by confirmation, who are already made, as our Church catechiſm declares, the children of grace: but it is another leading fallacy of theſe Rebukers of others, that with the praiſes of our excellent liturgy ever in their mouths, they very diſintereſtedly ſtrip it of its moſt ſacred prerogatives ....; *Converſion*, properly ſo called, however it may be the occaſional, is *by no means* the general office, of the Miniſter of the Goſpel. Thoſe who have been joining with him in the prayers of the Church, who have, &c.; perſons who have thus united with their Miniſter in the holy office of our Church, he conſiders,—can he do leſs?—as Believers, as

(o) Above, p. 116. (p) See above, p. 115—125.
(q) Antijac. Review for April, 1799, p. 369. (r) Mr. Polwhele's Letter, p. 10. (s) Sermon 5c, p. 8, 9.

in poſſeſſion of the true faith, in a word, as fellow Chriſtians with himſelf [d]."

Whatever of *radical* and *internal change* is allowed neceſſary at any time, is, we ſee, ſuppoſed to have been effected, as a matter of courſe, *once for all* [e], wherever the external rite of baptiſm has been obſerved in our infancy [t]. What theſe teachers therefore chiefly mean by repentance, is, *outward reformation*, or at the moſt ſome very *partial* change of character. "It is," they tell us, "to ceaſe to evil, and to learn to do well [v]:" It is the "gradual amendment of life and converſation [w]:" Or, if more is allowed requiſite, it is only in reſpect to the more abandoned part of mankind. "However indulgent," Dr. Carr ſays, "the Saviour of the world may be to the accidental failures of infirmities, or paſſion; . . . if we have fallen into adultery, theft, murder, &c. our repentance muſt cloſely follow [x]." ——Let us then again have recourſe to our ſtandard, and ſee how the *Church* teaches on this ſubject.

3. And firſt, it muſt be conſidered that thoſe for whom ſhe prepared her public writings were neither Jews nor Heathens, but perſons, to uſe the language of our opponents, "born Chriſtians;" and who generally had been baptized in their infancy. Whatever her doctrines are, they muſt therefore chiefly reſpect perſons in this ſituation. It has

(d) Sermon p. 12, 13.—"Inſtead of aiming at the *converſion* of ſinners," the great Man juſt quoted, further obſerves, "the Miniſter thinks he hath done his part, when he hath ſhown his Wit, and the hearer his, when he hath commended it." Mr. Boyle's Life, as above.

(e) Although according to his own account, "there is reaſon to ſuppoſe that more than common pains have been taken" in the compoſition of his diſcourſe, Mr. Haggitt is certainly in danger of being called to Order by his Brethren, for "publiſhing *two fold* doctrines of regeneration, one at the Font" and another at Confirmation. See Antijac. Rev. March 1800. p. 296.

(t) See Note p. (v) Theophilus St. John as above. (w) Dr. Paley's Viſita, Ser. p. 17. (x) Ser. 50. p. 112.

already appeared that she supposes such persons may be destitute of "the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, and a true lively faith," and not in a state of salvation [y].

To whom then does the church of England believe repentance necessary? Her answer is, to *every person* admitted into her communion who has arrived at years of discretion. Whatever may be the state of Infants, this duty she considers *all* who would be really Christians, "bound to perform, when they come to age [z]." She most solemnly exacts it at Confirmation; she insists upon a renewal and continuation of it, in her Communicants; all her Worshippers speak the genuine language of it; she positively maintains, that without it, partaking in her external ordinances only increases men's condemnation.

But what does our church conceive is *implied* in repentance? Her catechism answers; It is "to renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh." Her Homilies add; It is "utterly to detest and abhor sin;" "from the very bottom of our hearts to detest and abhor it;" from the considerations of its "filthiness," and that "God cannot but detest and abhor us for it," and that "it cost the dear heart's blood of his only begotten Son our Saviour [a]." She has moreover defined it, "A *returning again of the whole man to God*, from whom we be fallen away by sin [b]:" "A forsaking all manner of things that are repugnant and contrary unto God's will, and giving our hearts unto him, and the whole strength of our bodies and souls [c]:" "A renouncing our former wicked life, and a FULL CONVERSION TO GOD in a new life [d]." "For they," she says, "that do truly repent, must be *clean altered and changed*, they must become NEW CREATURES [e]."

(y) See above p. 103. (z) See Catechism. (a) On Repentance, p. 338, 349. (b) Ibid. p. 336. (c) Ibid. 338. (d) Ibid. p. 348. (e) Ibid. p. 346.

She cannot, we ſee, be more expreſs againſt ſubſtituting any merely *outward* or *partial* change for true Repentance. It is the man, the whole man, that muſt be clean changed. His repentance muſt extend to the "heart," the "whole heart," the "very bottom of the heart." "For ſince," ſhe ſays, "that the heart is the fountain of all our works, as many as do with their *whole heart* turn unto the Lord, do live unto him only [f]." And this repentance, ſhe teaches, Chriſt was exalted to *give* unto Iſrael; and "they," ſhe adds, "who think that they have done much *of themſelves* towards repentance, are ſo much more the farther from God [g]." It is the office of "the Holy Ghoſt to ſanctify and regenerate" men; and "the more it is hidden from our underſtanding, the more it ought to move all men to wonder at the ſecret and mighty working of God's Holy Spirit, which is within us. For it is the Holy Ghoſt, and no other thing, that doth quicken the minds of men, ſtirring up good and godly motions in their hearts, which are agreeable to the will and commandments of God, ſuch as otherwiſe of their own crooked and perverſe nature they would never have. That which is born of the ſpirit, is ſpirit. . . . As for the works of the ſpirit, the fruits of faith, charitable and godly motions, if he (man) have any at all in him, they proceed only of the Holy Ghoſt, who is the only worker of our ſanctification, and maketh us new men in Chriſt Jeſus. . . . Such is the power of the Holy Ghoſt to regenerate men, and as it were to bring them forth anew, ſo that they ſhall be nothing like the men they were before. Neither doth he think it ſufficient inwardly to work the ſpiritual and new birth of man, unleſs he do alſo dwell and abide in him [z]." She prays accordingly, that her members may be "raiſed from the death of ſin unto the life of right-

(f) Ibid. p. 338. (g) Ibid. p. 337. (z) Hom. for Whitſunday, p. 291.

conſneſs[h];" that God would "create and make in them new and contrite hearts[i];" that "being regenerate, &c. they may *daily be renewed* by his holy ſpirit[k];" that he would "ſo work in our hearts by the power of this Holy Spirit, that we being *regenerate*, and *newly born again* in all goodneſs, &c. may in the end be made partakers of everlaſting life[z]." To the ſame effect prays her illuſtrious member Lord Bacon: "O Lord," . . . he ſays, "thou art not delighted in the death of ſinners, but in their *converſion*. Turn our hearts, and we ſhall be turned; *convert* us, and we ſhall be *converted;* illuminate the eyes of our minds and underſtanding with the bright beams of thy Holy Spirit, that we may daily grow in the ſaving knowledge of the heavenly myſtery of our redemption, wrought by our dear Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt; ſanctify our wills and affection by the ſame Spirit, the moſt ſacred fountain of all grace and goodneſs. . . . Increaſe our weak faith, grant it may daily bring forth the true fruits of unfeigned repentance, that by the power of the death of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, we may daily die unto ſin, and by the power of his reſurrection we may be quickened, and raiſed up to *newneſs* of life, may be *truly born anew*, and may be effectually made partakers of the firſt reſurrection, that then the ſecond death may never have dominion over us[y]."

Such are the ideas of our Church reſpecting the *change* of character which repentance implies. She clearly then ſees, in theſe days, ſome meaning in the obnoxious terms converſion, regeneration, renovation, &c. She ſees no abſurdity in attempting to *convert* thoſe who have already joined in her ſervice. She conſiders ſuch a converſion neceſſary in all her adult members; and, of courſe, that one part of "the general office" of her miniſters is to enforce it.

(h) Burial Ser. (i) Collect on Aſh. Wed. (k) Coll. for Chriſtmasday. (z) Hom. for Whitſunday, p. 294. (y) Works, Vol. iv. p. 507.

We have ſtill to inquire what her opinion is reſpecting *contrition* and *ſolicitude of mind*, as accompanying this change? And this, we find, ſhe conſiders eſſential to it. After affirming that "there are four parts of repentance;" "the firſt," ſhe ſays, "is the contrition of the heart." "For," as ſhe proceeds, "we muſt be earneſtly ſorry for our ſins, and unfeignedly lament and bewail that we have by them ſo grievouſly offended our moſt bounteous and merciful God [l]." We muſt "have a thorough feeling of our ſins;" we muſt, like the hearers of St. Peter, be "compunct and and pricked in our hearts [m]." And is not this implied in all her humiliating confeſſions, and urgent cries for mercy? What does ſhe mean when ſhe exhorts her members to "return unto our Lord God with all contrition and meekneſs of heart; bewailing and lamenting their ſinful life [n]?" What do her children mean when they plead for mercy and deliverance as "miſerable ſinners, and miſerable offenders [o];" when they pray for "new and contrite hearts, that worthily lamenting their ſins, and acknowledging their wretchedneſs, they may obtain forgiveneſs through Jeſus Chriſt [p]?" With what ſpirit do they "acknowledge and bewail their manifold ſins and wickedneſs, which moſt grievouſly they have committed, provoking moſt juſtly God's wrath and indignation againſt them;" and tell God, that "they earneſtly repent, and are heartily ſorry for theſe their miſdoings, that the remembrance of them is grievous unto them, and the burden of them intolerable [q]?"——In the name of common ſenſe, does all this only imply thoſe gentle touches of remorſe for ſome ſcandalous tranſgreſſions which our opponents dream of, which are ſcarcely perceptible to the penitents themſelves, and in no caſe perceptible to others, and compatible with every ſpecies of gaiety?

(l) Hom. on Repent. p. 342. (m) Ibid. p. 343. (n) Commina. Ser. (o) General Confeſſion, and Litany. (p) Coll. Aſh. Wed. (q) Communion Ser.

A ſpecimen of the penitential language of our leading Martyrs has already been produced. A paſſage from Bradford ſhall here be added. "I pray you," he ſays to Mr. Traves, "in your communication with God, have me, of all ſinners, a moſt negligent, unthankful, and wretched, in remembrance: That at length I might truly convert and return. . . . This paper, pen, and ink, yea, the marble-ſtone, weepeth, to ſee my ſlothful ſecurity, and unthankful hardneſs, to ſo merciful and long ſuffering a Lord. I confeſs it, I confeſs it though not tremblingly, humbly, or penitently; yet I confeſs it, oh! hypocritically I confeſs it. Therefore pray, pray for me, ut reſipiſcam, et ut Deum convertar, &c. [z]."——Yet this "Bradford," Mr. Strype calls *one* of "four prime pillars of the reformed church of England [y]." Of this Bradford, Biſhop Ridley ſaid, "In my conſcience I judge him more worthy to be a Biſhop, than many of us that are Biſhops already, are of being Pariſh Prieſts [x]."——We will only requeſt attention to one paſſage more.

"When good men," ſaith the Homily on faſting, "feel in themſelves the heavy burden of ſin, ſee damnation to be the reward of it, and behold with the eye of their mind the horror of hell, they tremble, they quake, and are inwardly touched with ſorrowfulneſs of heart for their offences, and cannot but accuſe themſelves and open this their grief unto Almighty God, and call unto him for mercy. This being done ſeriouſly, their mind is ſo occupied, partly with ſorrow and heavineſs, partly with an earneſt deſire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, that all deſire of meat and drink is laid apart, and loathſomneſs of all worldly things and pleaſures cometh in place, ſo that nothing then liketh them more, than to weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour of body, to ſhow

(z) See Strype's Ecc. Mem. Vol. iii. Catalogue, No. 31. (y) Ibid. p. 254. (x) Strype's Life of Grindal, p. 8.

themſelves weary of this life[r]." "Thus," it proceeds to ſay, "did David, Daniel, Eſther, Nehemias, the Ninevites, and all the children of Iſrael, faſt and repent[s]."

Here then, I appeal to Dr. Croft, Dr. Paley, Mr. Polwhele, Mr. Clapham, Mr. Ludlam, and the whole body of thoſe who profeſs not to know what Experience means in religion, to ſay, whether if any perſon, with the leaſt pretenſion to decency of conduct, ſhould ſeriouſly adopt this language, or by any means diſcover this ſtate of mind, now, they would not conſider him a Methodiſt; and whether if he conſulted them as Divines, they would not think of a Strait-waiſtcoat for him?

And, I again appeal to every competent and unprejudiced judge to ſay, which party teaches moſt like the church of England on this ſubject; *we*, who allow men to be ſerious in this moſt ſerious cauſe; or *they*, who are ſo diſpoſed to ſlight, and even to ridicule real ſolicitude about the ſpiritual ſtate: *we*, who urge the neceſſity of a practical, radical, and general change of character; or *they*, who reſt ſo much upon hereditary diſtinctions, and external reformation, and, at the moſt, require only ſome very partial amelioration of heart and principles: *we*, who aſcribe true converſion to God, to the agency of the Divine Spirit; or *they*, who conſider it a work which is "eaſy and natural" to man?

(r) Hom. on Faſting, p. 175. (s) Ibid.

CHAP. VI.

The queſtion proſecuted with regard to the doctrine of JUSTIFICATION.

WE proceed to the doctrine of a ſinner's *Juſtification* before God. "How ſhall man be juſt with God[a]?" A more important inquiry cannot occupy the attention of rational creatures. All who ſee and feel themſelves in the condition deſcribed by the church, under the two preceding particulars, will thus conſider it. All others, as an eminent Reformer has well obſerved, will only amuſe themſelves with ingenious trifling on the ſubject[b].

It may here be premiſed, that this doctrine formed a principal controverſy between the Romaniſts and the Reformers, and particularly between Gardiner and Cranmer[c]; that the whole body of the Proteſtant churches were agreed upon it[d]; and that on this primary article they all diſagreed with the church of Rome[e]. It would therefore undergo the fulleſt diſcuſſions, and we have the moſt general and determinate concluſions upon it.

It is moreover already obvious, that on this point too, in eſtimating the judgment of our church, we muſt keep in view her ideas of man's diſeaſe, eſpecially her notions of his natural impotence in reſpect to divine things. It follows indeed, of courſe, from hence that ſhe muſt either repreſent him as ſaved wholly by grace, or as not ſaved at all.

(a) Job ix. 2. (b) Calvin Inſtit. L. 3. Cap. 12. § 1. (c) See Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 149. (d) See Corpus Confeſſionum, &c. Art. 5. (e) See Second Letter to the Author of the Confeſſional, p. 34.

The charge then, in reſpect to us, is, that we aſcribe too much to *Grace*, to *Chriſt*, and to *Faith*, in this matter, and too little to Good works, to comparative Innocence, to Reformation, and other performances and conditions, on the part of man. We cannot however, with our viewsof ſcripture and of man's native powers, relax on the point. Our uniform doctrine is,——"That we are juſtified BY *faith only*," and "*only* FOR *the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*[f]." And we think that we adhere moſt punctually to the church in theſe opinions. But this is the ſubject of our preſent inveſtigation. Let us then firſt inquire,

2. Whoſe ideas moſt reſemble hers with regard to *what is meant by juſtification?*——OUR views of this particular are fully expreſſed by Archbiſhop Cranmer in his "Diſcourſe of Juſtification" on reviewing the Erudition of a Chriſtian man. To be juſtified, this Prelate here ſhows, is to "have the forgiveneſs of our ſins, to be reconciled to God, to be accepted, and reputed juſt and righteous in his ſight[g]." And, omitting altogether ſubjects who are incapable of faith, this we conceive is effected when a man rightly believes.

Our oppoſers talk of "two juſtifications," which they denominate "our *firſt* and our *final* juſtification." The *firſt*, they teach, is all that is attainable in this life, and means "our admiſſion into Chriſtianity," or "a Chriſtian ſociety," and "belongs to all profeſſed Chriſtians without exception." Thus teaches Biſhop Watſon, from Taylor the the Socinian[h]. Dr. Hey approaches infinitely near him. The above language is all equally his, except the laſt clauſe of the ſentence. "Our church," this Divine alſo ſays, calls "the admiſſion into Chriſtianity our *firſt* juſtification,"

(f) See Art. 11. (g) See Strype's Life of Cranmer, Appendix, p. 60. (h) Tracts, Vol, iii. Taylor's Key, p. 360 and paſſim.

and uſes "the word juſtification as *ſynonimous* to Baptiſm [i]." This is the expreſs doctrine of Mr. Daubeny. The confuſion on this ſubject he ſays, is to be attributed to a want of "attention to the ſenſe in which the word juſtification is uſed in the articles:" and adds, "the word juſtification, as it was uſed at the Reformation, was conſidered as *ſynonimous with baptiſm*:" and that accordingly, "By our juſtification is primarily to be underſtood our admiſſion into Chriſtianity [z]." He then talks of "man's firſt juſtification," and his "final juſtification;" and ſupports theſe notions by the arguments, and nearly the words, uſed by Dr. Hey [y].

In anſwer to one of theſe opinions, it may however ſuffice to obſerve, that no ſuch diſtinction can be found in any of the legitimate writings of our church. Certainly there is nothing like it in her articles and homilies on the ſubject. And in reſpect to the notion, that "juſtification is ſynonimous to baptiſm;" Dr. Hey himſelf allows, that "the word" is "*ſeldom*, if *ever*," uſed in this ſenſe, except in our article and homily [k]. And does not this circumſtance render it highly improbable that it is ſo uſed there? Does it not far more than outweigh the ſingle expreſſion "baptized or juſtified" in the homily [l]? Dr. Hey allows too, that there are ſuch Beings as mere "nominal Chriſtians," and that the 13th Article, which treats "of works done before juſtification," is "chiefly intended for nominal Chriſtians [m]." But, if baptiſm, or the bare admiſſion into the Chriſtian religion, means the ſame as juſtification, what ſenſe is there in this article, or in the doctrine it maintains, as applicable to ſuch perſons? Can they who are already admitted into Chriſtianity do works *before* they are admitted into it? Or, can almoſt *any* member of our church, when almoſt univerſally they are admitted in their infancy, *ever* do ſuch works?

(i) Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 268, 270, 334, 336. (z) Appendix, p. 182. (y) Ibid. and p. 583. (k) Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 336. (l) On Salva. part 3d. (m) Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 378.

But the notion is overthrown by their own hypothesis; namely, that it supposes "men to do their part faithfully;" and that we are then only "put into *a way* of being eternally happy, if all things go on well;" but that "we may lose our way [n]."—Now if this mean, that we may lose our justification, and Dr. H. speaks of "our being restored to it [o];" then, if justification be the same as baptism, in order to regain it, we must be baptized. "Justification," he also says, is "supposed *variable*; sometimes *increasing*, sometimes *decreasing* [p]." But howcan our baptism *vary*, and be increased and decreased [z]?

Even the passage quoted from their favourite, though very illegitimate, authority, the "Necessary Doctrine, &c." is nothing to their purpose. This only mentions baptism, as the way "by the which God hath determined that man BEING OF AGE and coming to christendom should be justified [q];" It certainly does not hence follow that it is the way by which those who are *not of age*, and therefore not capable of faith and repentance, are justified. Our Church decides favourably, as doubtless she ought, on the condition of baptized infants, who die in their infancy. But all who arrive at maturity she supposes to be sinners; and "they," she

---

(n) Ibid. p. 334, 336; and Daubeny's Appendix, p. 149.

(o) Nor. Lect. p. 268. (p) Ibid. p 335.

(z) Mr. Hooker, speaking of the Romanists, says, "The first receipt of Grace, in their divinity, is the first justification; the increase thereof, the second justification..... Unto such as have attained the first justification, that is to say the first receipt of grace, it is applied further by good works to the increase of former grace, which is the second justfication. If they work more and more, grace doth more and more increase, and they are more and more justified." Disc. on Justification, p. 19.—But these notions Mr. H. mentions amongst those in which the Romanists *differ* from us, and after the mention of which he adds; "This is the mystery of the man of sin. This maze the Church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread, when they ask her the way of justification."—Ibid.

(q) Nor. Lect. p. 336.

teaches, "who in act or deed sin after baptism, are washed by Christ's sacrifice from their sins," or obtain this blessing of justification, "when they turn again to God unfeignedly [r]."——What she really *does* mean by it shall appear presently. It shall only first be further observed,

That some of these Divines confine justification wholly to the *pardon of sin*; and that this they often so explain as to mean very little except our Reformation [s]. According to Mr. Ludlam the justification of a sinner in the court of heaven is *utterly impossible*. The term, it is well known, is forensic, and opposed to condemnation, and signifies to be absolved and acquitted, or pronounced just and innocent, in judgment [g]. With this idea in view, Mr. Milner has said, "By the doctrine of Justification is meant, the particular method laid down in scripture of honourably acquitting sinful men before their God, through the atonement and righteousness of Jesus Christ [h]." This "definition of justification," Mr. Ludlam says, "is unintelligible," and "utterly inconsistent;" "For, sinful men, so far from being *honourably acquitted, cannot be acquitted at all*." They "may," he says, "be *pardoned* for the sake of another," but not "acquitted." "It is upon account of his *own innocence* ONLY, and upon *no other* account whatsoever," neither "upon account of, for the sake of, or through the doings or sufferings of another," "that a man can be honourably acquitted." "That acquittance *alone is honourable* where there is *no suspicion of guilt* [i]." Now that in the judgment of the scriptures and our Church, "all men," considered in themselves, are sinful, and "guilty before God," and "condemned by the law [k]," it is impossible to deny. If

(r) Hom. on Salva. p. 12. (s) See Bishop Watson, Tracts, Vol. 6. 322, 350, 389, from Bishop Fowler; and Dr. Balguy's Ser. 4. p. 58, and Charges passim. (g) See Leigh's Critica Sacra; and Cruden's Concordance. (h) Pamphlet on the Life of Wm. Howard, p. 43. (i) First Essay, p. 19. n. (k) See Rom. iii. 19; Hom. on Salva. p. 16.

Mr. L. therefore is right, their acquittal or juſtification is impoſſible. All that God Almighty himſelf their Maker and Preſerver, and Jeſus Chriſt their Redeemer, Advocate, and Judge, *can* do for creatures ſo circumſtanced is to *pardon* them.

Our Church however moſt unequivocally teaches, that "for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, by faith," we are not only pardoned, but "*accounted righteous* before God[l]:" that beſides "the remiſſion of our ſins," we are made "of unjuſt, juſt before God[m]: that "Chriſt is now the *righteouſneſs* of all them that truly believe in him;" that "he for them paid their ranſom by his death;" that "he for them *fulfilled the law* in his life; ſo that now *in him* and *by him*, every true Chriſtian man may be called a fulfiller of the law[n]." "And this juſtification or righteouſneſs," ſhe ſays, "which we ſo receive of God's mercy and Chriſt's merits, embraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and full juſtification;" that "by this ſacrifice we are waſhed from our ſins, brought to God's favour; and made his children, and inheritors of his kingdom of heaven." "This," ſhe adds, "is that juſtification or righteouſneſs which St. Paul ſpeaketh of when he ſaith, 'no man is juſtified by the works of the law, but freely by faith in Jeſus Chriſt[o].'——So in other places, Chriſt, ſhe ſaith, "hath purchaſed for us the undoubted pardon and forgiveneſs of our ſins, and made at one the Father of heaven with us, in ſuch wiſe, that he taketh us now for his loving children, and for the true inheritors, with Chriſt his natural ſon, of the kingdom of heaven[p]." Surely all this means ſomething more than our *bare pardon as criminals*. It is treating us as if we had

(l) Art. 11. (m) Hom. on Salva. p. 17. (n) Ibid. p. 14. (o) Ibid. p. 12. (p) Hom. on the Paſſion, p. 261.

never offended, and exalting us to the higheſt privileges and honours.

The ſame ſentiments are fully expreſſed by all the principal founders of our Church, in their other writings.—Thus, in the Confeſſion ſigned by Ferrar, Coverdale, Hooper, Taylor, Bradford, Rogers, &c. in Queen Mary's time, our juſtification is repreſented as implying "the forgiveneſs of our ſins, and *Chriſt's righteouſneſs imputed* to us[q]."——Nowell's Catechiſm teaches, that "God both forgives our ſins, and *ſo gives us the righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, by faith, that *on account of this* we are accepted as if it were *our own*[r]."——Archbiſhop Cranmer repeatedly deſcribes juſtification in nearly the very words of our article, the being "reputed righteous[s]."——Biſhop Latimer is very explicit. "When," he ſays, "we believe in him (our Saviour) it is like as if we had no ſins. For he changeth with us: He *taketh* our ſins and wickedneſs from us, and *giveth us* his holineſs, righteouſneſs, juſtice, fulfilling of the law; and ſo conſequently everlaſting life. So that we be like as if we had done no ſin at all. For *his righteousneſs* ſtandeth us in *ſo good ſtead as though we of ourſelves had fulfilled the law to the uttermoſt*[t]." "The righteouſneſs of Chriſt is accounted to be our righteouſneſs[v]."——"I believe," proceeds the great Lord Bacon, "That the ſufferings and merits of Chriſt, as they are ſufficient to do away the ſins of the whole world, ſo they are only effectual to thoſe who are regenerate by the Holy Ghoſt; who breatheth where he will of free grace; which grace, as a ſeed incorruptible, quickeneth the ſpirit of man, and conceiveth him anew a ſon of God and member of Chriſt: ſo that Chriſt having man's fleſh, and man having Chriſt's ſpirit, there is an open paſſage and *mutual imputation*, whereby *ſin and wrath*

(q) Fox's Acts, p. 1641. (r) p. 110. (s) See above, p. 179. (t) Sermons, Vol. ii. p. 321. (v) Ibid. p. 871.

was conveyed to Christ from man; and *merit and life* is conveyed to man from Christ [m]."

We will only add the sentiments of the judicious Hooker on the subject. Speaking of the man "who is found in Christ through faith," "Him," he says, "God upholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not imputing it; taketh quite away the punishment due thereunto by pardoning it; and accepteth him in Jesus Christ as *perfectly righteous, as if he had fulfilled all that was commanded him in the law.*——Shall I say *more perfectly righteous, than if himself had fulfilled the whole law?* I must take heed what I say; but the Apostle saith, 'God made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him:' Such are we in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God himself [w]."

So very different are the sentiments of our Church and and her most celebrated primitive Writers from those of Mr. Ludlam! He thinks "sinful men" can only be pardoned, and cannot even be acquitted, on account of the Saviour: They think, that on believing in this Saviour, such men are thus accounted righteous, accepted into favour and confidence, and entitled to those exalted rewards.

So very different are the views of the great Philosopher Bacon, and the *judicious* Hooker, from those of the *poetical* Mr Polwhele, and his Colleagues! What the former thus fully state and zealously inculcate, the latter represent as most *absurd, dangerous, impious,* and blasphemous! Thus, to exhibit Mr. P.'s own words, "You inform your parishioner," he says to Dr. Hawker, "that 'as the sins of his people are transferred to the person of Jesus, so his righteousness is imputed to them also;' and that, in consequence of this imputation, 'they are considered as right-

(m) Works, Vol. iv. p. 456. (w) Disc. on Justification, annexed to Ecc. Pol. folio, p. 20.

eous before God.' Surely this is one of the *moſt abſurd and dangerous* doctrines that ever was deviſed by man. If the righteousneſs of Chriſt be imputed to the faithful, ſo as to become (as you teach us) their righteouſneſs, it follows, that the faithful are *equally righteous*; and indeed, that the faithful are, in the eye of God, as *righteous as Chriſt himſelf!!!* How impious; how blaſphemous[x]!"

But to return to Mr. Ludlam: The fact is, that conſidered in its original import, and reſtricted preciſely to the practice of human tribunals, as Mr. L. ſeems to reſtrict it, juſtification is not only perfectly *diſtinct* from pardon, but is abſolutely *incompatible* with it. A man cannot *there* be both pardoned and juſtified at once. To be pardoned he muſt be ſuppoſed guilty; to be juſtified he muſt be ſuppoſed innocent. But in reſpect to our caſe before God, pardon and juſtification are always connected[y]. We are pardoned, as ſinners, for the ſake of Chriſt, "who paid our ranſom;" we are juſtified, as intereſted by faith in his righteouſneſs, who, in this reſpect, "fulfilled the law for us." So at leaſt the above extracts plainly teach.

But how can the epithet "honourably" be applied to this mode of acquittal? Now clearly it is neither "inconſiſtent" nor "unintelligible," if it can properly be applied either to the judge who acquits, or to the perſons acquitted. Mr. Milner, I doubt not, had chiefly the honour of the former in view. Mr. Ludlam does not ſeem to have conſidered that at all. It is however the diſtinguiſhing glory of the method of ſalvation in queſtion, that it provides equally for the honour of both[z]. Thoſe who view the tranſaction in the light in which the above quotations place it, will find no difficulty in thinking honourably of the be-

---

(x) Letter, p. 40, 41; See alſo Fellowes' Anti-Calviniſt, p. 12, where a ſimilar outrage upon this doctrine is committed; &c. &c.

(y) See Rom. iv. 1, &c.

(z) See Luke ii. 10—14; 1 Cor. i.; 2 Cor. iv.

liever's case. And in respect to the honour of God, the direct object of this scheme of justification is to declare and demonstrate it. "God," the Apostle says expressly, "hath set forth Jesus Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to *declare his righteousness*, that he might be *just* and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus [a]."

In this light it is unquestionably considered by our church. To omit all other evidence, the greatest part of the first homily on salvation is occupied in showing it. "Our heavenly Father," she here says, "prepared for us Christ's body and blood, whereby our ransom might be fully paid, the law fulfilled, and his *justice fully satisfied*." One of three things which she says go together in our justification is, "upon Christ's part *justice*, that is, the *satisfaction* of God's justice." "The great wisdom of God in this mystery of our redemption, . . . with his endless mercy joined his most upright and equal justice." "He provided a ransom for us, that was, the most precious body and blood of his own most dear and best beloved Son Jesus Christ, who besides this ransom, fulfilled the law for us perfectly. And so the *justice* of God and his mercy did embrace together, and fulfilled the mystery of our redemption. And of this justice and mercy of God knit together," she adds, "speaketh St. Paul in the third Chapter to the Romans [b];" which she proceeds to quote, and to interpret precisely as we have done.

If, then, in this method of acquitting sinful men before God, there is neither any impeachment of the honour of the judge, nor any remaining suspicion attached to their own characters, they are doubtless *honourably acquitted*.—— And thus we see, how perfectly the sentiments of that eminent Christian and respectable Divine whom Mr. Ludlam contemptuously styles 'Joseph Milner," are in unison with those of the church; and how perfectly Mr. L.'s differ from

(a) Rom. iii. 20—26. (b) p. 12—14.

her.——Instead therefore of expressing this unmerited contempt, might not Mr. L. more properly have been inquiring, with what conscience he subscribes "ex animo" to doctrines which he believes *unintelligible and impossible?*

3. But what is the *Faith* of which we hear so much, in this matter of our justification? And in what sense are we *justified by faith?* And who adheres to the established doctrine on these points?

What WE mean by this faith is well expressed in the definition given of it in the homily on salvation. "The right and true Christian faith," it is here affirmed, after a recital of the chief history respecting our Saviour, "is, not only to believe that holy scripture, and all the foresaid articles of our faith are true, but *also to have a sure trust and confidence in God's merciful promises* to be saved from everlasting damnation by Christ: whereof doth follow a loving heart to obey his commandments [c]." It is a *cordial belief of God's testimony*, and *a reliance on his promises*. But the grand scope of these, revelation throughout, are, "the record which God hath given of his Son," and the promise of "the gift of eternal life in him [d]." Justifying faith, therefore, especially implies, a receiving with interest and approbation, "the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son," and "a sure trust and confidence in God" for salvation through Christ Jesus.

This faith, we maintain, is as *distinct* from love, good works, and obedience in general, as a tree is from its fruit; but, that it is *inseparably connected* with these graces, and *always productive* of them.——And, the way in which it justifies, is, not as possessing any *merit*, but "as the only ordained *mean* and *instrument* by which we thus receive, apprehend," and "apply to ourselves the fruits and merits of Christ's death [e];" or, as Bishop Horsley expresses it,

(c) Page 18. (d) 1 John, v. 9—11. (e) Hom. on Passion, p. 272.

"because it is the *first principle* of that communion between the believer's soul and the divine Spirit, on which the whole of our spiritual life depends [f]."

Very different are the notions of our opponents respecting faith. Mr. Clapham does not seem to consider the belief of *any* particular creed essential to the forming of a good man, and obtaining the approbation of our Judge. He talks of a season "when every good man, of *whatever persuasion*, shall have praise of God [g]." Mr. Polwhele is "well assured," that "*be our persuasions what they may*,... if we do our duty to the best of our knowledge and abilities, we shall be finally accepted at the throne of mercy [h]." Dr. Hey says, the "faith only," by which we are said to be justified, "in our article, means, an *honest principle* [i]." "Man," he says in another place, "is justified on being admitted into the christian society, and.... he must have that *fidelity* which every plain man has on entering into every society;" "the disposition of an honest man entering into any contract, or business [k]." Mr. Ludlam expresses much scorn at the respectable author of the "Scripture characters," for talking of "a spiritual union with Christ [l]," as formed by faith; and "of communion between Jesus and our own souls [m]." These phrases he deems perfectly unintelligible, and the doctrine implied in them perfectly unscriptural. "Surely," he says, "the scriptures say nothing of any union, either spiritual or sensible, with Christ [z]." "I do not find any mention of this communion

(f) Charge, 1792, p 28. (g) Sermon at Boro. p. 9.
(h) Letter, p. 88. (i) Vol. iii. p. 278. (k) Ibid. p. 270.
(l) Four Essays, p. 49. (m) Ibid. p. 46.

(z) Archbishop Tillotson would teach Mr. L. that the 15th Chap. of St. John says something of this kind. "Our Saviour," his Grace observes, "compares his mystical body, that is his Church, to a vine,

with Jeſus in ſcripture." And "what," he aſks with an air of great confidence, "are we to underſtand by the communion of one intelligent being with another intelligent being[n]?"

It is common to repreſent Chriſtian faith as ſtrictly implying no more than an *aſſent to the truth of Chriſtianity*; or, as Mr. Benſon expreſſes it, "an allowance that Jeſus is the Meſſiah[o];" or, according to Mr. Daubeny, ſuch a faith as St. James mentions. "St. James has always appeared to me," Mr. D. ſays, "to ſpeak, not of a man who merely *ſays* that he has faith, and has it not; but of one who *actually poſſeſſes faith*, but a faith unavailable to ſalvation, in conſequence of its being unaccompanied by its correſpondent effects[p]." This then is ſuppoſed to be the *faith* that is required, and all that is ſuppoſed wanting is *works*. When

---

which his Father, whom he compares to a huſbandman, hath planted. To repreſent to us the *Union* that is betwixt Chriſt and all true Chriſtians, and the influence of grace and ſpiritual life, which all that are united to him do derive and receive from him, he ſets it forth to us by the reſemblance of a vine and branches. As there is a natural vital union between the vine and the branches, ſo there is a *ſpiritual union* between Chriſt and true Chriſtians; and this union is the cauſe of our fruitfulneſs in the works of obedience and a good life. There are ſome indeed that ſeem to be grafted into Chriſt by an outward profeſſion of Chriſtianity, who yet derive no influence from him, ſo as to bring forth fruit, becauſe they are not vitally united to him."——Sermons, Vol. 3. p. 307; and quoted by Jonathan Edwards.

(n) Four Eſſays, p. 46—52.

The judicious Hooker will inform him, that "Communion with Chriſt conſiſts in the participation of Chriſt's Spirit, which Cyprian in that reſpect well termeth Germaniſſimam Societatem, the higheſt and trueſt Society that can be between man and him, who is both God and Man in one. Eccles. Pol. B. 5. §. 56. And hither we refer Mr. L. for a full illuſtration and vindication of our doctrine.

(o) Sermon ii. p. 30; ſee alſo Fellowes' Anti-Cal. p. 18; and Haggitt's Sermon, p. 13. (p) Guide, p. 301.

therefore we are said to be juſtified by *faith*, and by *faith only*, theſe divines ſay, that in this caſe, faith ſignifies "obedience to the whole religion of Chriſt, including both belief and practice [q]:" or, as they at other times expreſs it, "the complex of all Chriſtianity [r]:" or, in Mr. Daubeny's language, "faith in the *concrete* [s];" "faith as *comprehenſive* of all Chriſtian duties [t]." And this faith *juſtifies*, they ſay, not as it unites us to Chriſt, or is the inſtrument through which we apply his merits to ourſelves, or as it complies with "the precept of relying on Chriſt's merit for juſtification [v]; but as it thus "*implies true holineſs in the nature* of it [w]," as it *includes* "the other evangelical graces" as conſtituent parts of it; or, "as like love and repentance it is a fundamental cauſe of obedience." "It ſaves us no otherwiſe," Dr. Burn in his Sermons for the Clergy fully teaches, "than by being a ſpring and principle of our obedience [x]." The word "inſtrument," they ſay, is very "improper and obſcure," "and a nicety which Cranmer was not concerned in [y]."

Theſe opinions are all obviouſly very diſcordant from the notions of faith ſtated above, and recognized as ours [z]. And, as in this ſtatement, we adopted as our baſis the very language of the Church, it is already pretty obvious where the deviation from her on this point exiſts. But let us aſcertain the matter a little more fully.

It is then certainly as clear as language can make it, in the above definition [a], that ſhe means more by juſtifying faith than what ſo generally paſſes for faith, a *mere aſſent*

(q) See Biſhop Pretyman's Elements, Vol. ii. p. 264.
(r) Biſhop Burnet on Art. 11. p. 123, 124. (s) Appendix, p. 162.
(t) Guide, p. 291. (v) See Biſhop Watſon's Tracts, Vol. vi. p. 391, 392. (w) Ibid. (x) Vol. i. p. 11—13.
(y) Biſhop Burnet's Hiſt. of Reforma. Vol. i. p. 288 (z) p. 188.
(a) p. 188.

to the truth of the Chriſtian religion. "It is," ſhe ſays expreſsly, "not only to believe that holy ſcripture," and all the common articles of our faith, "are true, but *alſo to have a ſure truſt and confidence* in God's merciful promiſes, to be ſaved by Chriſt." It is alſo moſt clear from hence that *this truſt and confidence* is what ſhe deems further *eſſential* to it. It is equally clear that ſhe conſiders this faith *perfectly diſtinct* from love and obedience, and yet always productive of them, becauſe ſhe teaches, that they *proceed from*, and *follow it*: "whereof," ſhe adds, "doth *follow* a loving heart to obey his commandments."

Theſe ſentiments our church repeats ſo frequently, and expreſſes under ſo many forms, that to miſtake her meaning ſeems next to impoſſible. Thus in the Homily immediately on the ſubject, ſhe ſays again, "The faith which ſaveth ſinners is *not only* the common belief of the articles of our faith, but it is *alſo a true truſt and confidence* of the mercy of God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and a ſtedfaſt hope of all good things to be received at God's hand . . . for his Son's ſake [b]." The very ſame idea is expreſſed, in nearly the ſame words, in the ſucceeding page of this diſcourſe; and again very explicitly in the homily on the paſſion [c]; and in ſhort wherever this faith is the ſubject of diſcuſſion. She ſays moreover again and again, that, this pretended aſſent to the truth of Chriſtianity, or "the faith that conſiſteth only in believing in the word of God, that it is true," when deſtitute of *truſt in God and unfruitful*, is *not* the "right, pure, and lively faith; but a dead, deviliſh, counterfeit, and feigned faith, as St. Paul and St. James call it [d]." Nay, "this is not," ſhe ſays, "properly *called* faith;" and, that the man who only poſſeſſes this can no more be ſaid to believe *in God*, than he who has read and believes the hiſtory of Cæſar, can properly be ſaid to believe *in Cæſar*; and,

(b) Page 20. (c) Page 272, 273. (d) Hom. on Salva. p. 18.

that foraſmuch as it is thus "dead," producing neither comfort nor holineſs, "it is NOT NOW FAITH, as a *dead man is not a man* [e]." She does not, it is to be obſerved, like the Divines juſt noticed, allow that ſuch a man has the Chriſtian faith, and is only defective in obedience. She charges the defect upon his *faith*; and maintains moſt unequivocally that profeſſors of Chriſtianity who continue in evil living have "not true faith [f]." And yet clearly ſhe does not conſider good works as *component parts* of this faith; becauſe, in itſelf, the act of truſting in God is diſtinct from ſuch works; and becauſe, as was hinted above, ſhe every where diſtinguiſhes them as the fruits [g], effects [h], concomitants [i], and evidences [k], of true faith. Her conſtant doctrine alſo is, that this faith "is given us of God [l]," that it "is not ours but by God's working in us [m]."

In perfect harmony with theſe ſentiments is every other part of the legitimate evidence of our Church. The venerable Cranmer ſpeaks, preciſely like the homily, of a "dead faith" which is worthleſs, and of a "faith which operates," and enables the believer to ſay with Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, &c." And this latter he teaches "cannot but produce love and obedience." The "evil," he adds, "have not the right Chriſtian faith [n]."——The celebrated Nowell cloſely imitates him. "There is," this Divine ſays, "a general faith which conſiſts in aſſenting to the truth of God's word; this" he proceeds, "is called a *dead* faith, and is poſſeſſed by wicked men, and even devils. But the living and true Chriſtian faith is, a *certain perſuaſion of the paternal favour of God towards us through Chriſt*, and a

(e) Hom. on faith, p. 19, 20. (f) Hom. on Salva. p. 18. (g) Ibid. p. 19. (h) Hom. on faith, p. 20, 21. (i) Ibid. (k) Ibid. p, 21, 25. (l) Hom. on Salva. p. 17. (m) Ibid. p. 13. (n) Diſcourſes on Reviewing the Chriſtian man, Strype's Life, &c. Appendix, 57—61.

ſure expectation of the bleſſings promiſed in the goſpel, which *always* has joined with it a diſpoſition to obedience." "And this faith the wicked cannot have [o]."——The Biſhops and Martyrs in priſon, ſpeaking of juſtifying faith, ſay, "Which faith is not an opinion, but a *certain perſuaſion wrought by the Holy Ghoſt* in the mind and heart of man; where through as the mind is illumined, ſo the heart is ſuppled to ſubmit itſelf to God unfeignedly; and ſo ſhoweth forth an inherent righteouſneſs, which is to be diſcerned (diſtinguiſhed) in the article of juſtification, from the righteouſneſs which God endueth us withal, juſtifying us, although *inſeparably* they go together [p]."——And, if we may adduce a foreign teſtimony, the cautious Augſburg confeſſion uſes this language: "Admonentur etiam homines, quòd hîc nomen fidei non ſignificet tantùm hiſtoriæ notitiam, qualis eſt in impiis et diabolo, ſed ſignificet fidem, quæ credit non tantùm hiſtoriam, ſed etiam effectum hiſtoriæ, videlicet, hunc articulum, Remiſſionem peccatorum, quòd videlicet per Chriſtum habeamus gratiam, juſtitiam et remiſſionem peccatorum.—Jam qui ſcit, ſe per Chriſtum habere propitium Patrem, is verè novit Deum, ſcit, ſe ei curæ eſſe, invocat eum. Denique non eſt ſine Deo ſicut Gentes. Nam diaboli et impii non poſſunt hunc articulum credere, Remiſſionem peccatorum. Ideo Deum tanquam hoſtem oderunt, non invocant eum, nihil boni ab eo expectant. Auguſtinus etiam de fidei nomine hoc modo admonet lectorem, et docet, in Scripturis nomen fidei accipi, non pro notitia, qualis eſt in impiis, ſed pro fiducia, quæ conſolatur et erigit perterrefactas mentes [q]."

The branch of the ſubject which reſpects the *effects* of faith will meet us again under our head, good works [s]. Our preſent object is only to aſcertain what faith is, independent

(o) Page 47—49. (p) Fox's Acts, &c. p. 1641. (q) Art. 20.
(s) Ch. 7. §. 2.

of its effects. And is it not equally clear, from all this, both what the ſentiments of our Church on this point are, and who may juſtly claim a coincidence with her? Is it poſſible to reconcile any one of the opinions of our opponents above ſtated, with this notion of faith?

A few paſſages ſhall however be added reſpecting the *manner* in which faith is directly concerned in our juſtification. And this, in the language of our Church is, that it is "the *mean* whereby we muſt *apply the fruits and merits of Chriſt's death* unto us, ſo that it may work the ſalvation of our ſouls [t];" that it is "the only *mean and inſtrument* of ſalvation required on our parts [v];" that "it remitteth or appointeth us unto Chriſt, for to have only by him remiſſion of our ſins, or juſtification." "It faith unto us," as the Homily on ſalvation expreſſes it, "it is not *I* that take away your ſins, but it is Chriſt only, and to him only *I ſend you for that purpoſe*, forſaking therein all your good virtues, words, thoughts, and works, and only putting your truſt in Chriſt [w]."——And "becauſe," it is added, "*faith doth directly ſend us to Chriſt* for remiſſion of our ſins, and that by faith given us of God, we *embrace* the promiſe of God's mercy, and of the remiſſion of our ſins which thing none other of our virtues or works properly doth, therefore the ſcripture uſeth to ſay, that faith without works doth juſtify [x]."

It is, ſays Nowell, "the *hand by which we lay hold of* the mercy of God offered to us through Chriſt in the goſpel." It is the *inſtrument of juſtification*, which *embraces Chriſt*, who is our righteouſneſs, and *unites us ſo cloſely with him*, that we are made partakers of all his benefits [y]." "It is," adds the celebrated Biſhop Jewel in his Apology, "our faith that *applieth* the death and croſs of Chriſt, to our benefit [z]." "Chriſt," continues the judicious Hooker, "hath

(t) Hom. on Paſſion, p. 273. (v) Ibid. p. 272. (w) Hom. on Salva. p. 16. (x) Ibid. p. 17. (y) Page 111. (z) Page 73.

merited righteouſneſs for as many as are found *in him.* In him God findeth us if we be faithful; for *by faith* we are *incorporated into Chriſt* [z]." "Faith is the only *hand* which *putteth on Chriſt* unto juſtification; and Chriſt the only garment which being ſo put on, covereth the ſhame of our defiled natures [a]."

Now all this is exactly and undeniably the language which we uſe on the ſubject; but is utterly incompatible with their notions who cenſure us. How will Mr. Ludlam reconcile many parts of it with his denial of an *union* ſubſiſting between Chriſt and believers? What elſe but the ordinary ideas annexed to this phraſe, by ſuch Divines as Mr. Robinſon, is implied in the expreſſions being "in Chriſt," "putting on Chriſt," being "incorporated into Chriſt;" and in the very phraſe itſelf, being "ſo united to him" as to become partakers of all his benefits? How will he reconcile his diſguſt for this doctrine with the declarations of our Church, that "if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive the holy ſacrament, then we ſpiritually eat the fleſh of Chriſt, and drink his blood; then *we dwell in Chriſt*, and Chriſt *in us*; we are *one* with Chriſt, and Chriſt with us [b]:" That all true Chriſtians are "plants of the fruitful olive, living branches of the true vine, members indeed of Chriſt's myſtical body:" That "the unbelievers and faithleſs cannot feed upon Chriſt's precious body, whereas the *faithful* have their *life*, their *abiding in him*, their UNION, and as it were their *incorporation* with him [c]?" How is the rejection of this doctrine compatible with her adoption of St. John the 15th, and Epheſians the 4th and 5th into her ſervice, where this ſpiritual union is ſo largely diſcuſſed, and where it is declared that "we are members of his body, of his fleſh, and of his bones? How does it comport with her ſpeaking of "the ſpiritual marriage and UNITY betwixt Chriſt

(z) Diſcourſe on Juſtification, p. 20. (a) Ibid. p. 32.
(b) Exhortation at Commu. (c) Hom. on Sac. p. 285.

and his Church [d];" which she affirms, "is signified and represented" by the most intimate of unions with which we are acquainted, *that* formed by matrimony? All this must mean something more than the bare *profession* of Christ's religion, because she declares expressly that many who make such a profession are *incapable of this union*, and in a state of imminent guilt and danger [e].

Yet, to the same effect, all the eminent primitive writers of our church every where speak on this point.—Mr. Hooker, in his celebrated Ecclesiastical Polity, has a Section intitled, "The Union or mutual Participation, which is between Christ and the Church of Christ, in this present world."—And this "Participation," he says, "is that mutual inward hold which Christ hath of us, and we of him, in such sort, that each possesseth other by way of special interest, property, and inherent copulation."—And after a full illustration of the precise doctrine maintained by our writers, "Thus," he concludes, "we see . . . what communion Christ hath with his Church, how his church and every member thereof is in him by original derivation, and he personally in them by way of mystical association wrought through the gift of the Holy Ghost, which they that are his receive from him, and together with the same, what benefit soever the vital force of his body and blood may yield [z]." Perfectly consonant is the language of Lord Bacon. "The three heavenly unities exceed all natural unities: that is to say, the unity of the three persons in Godhead; the unity of God and Man in Christ; and the *unity of Christ and the Church;* the Holy Ghost being the worker of both these latter unities: for by the Holy Ghost was Christ incarnate and quickened in flesh, and by the Holy Ghost is man regenerate and quickened in spirit [y]."

---

d) Marriage Service. (e) See Note b, and c, above; &c.
(z) B. 5. § 56. (y) Works, Vol. iv. p. 456.

Surely it will require all the clearneſs of head which Mr. L. affects, to clear our church of the doctrine he cenſures, and to clear his own conſcience in the matter of ſubſcription on the point. Nor will the taſk of reconciliation with this umpire be eaſy to any of thoſe whoſe opinions have been ſpecified. Is it poſſible to reconcile her notions of the nature and province of juſtifying faith with their ideas on the ſubject, who are confident we may be good Chriſtians and ſure of heaven *whatever be our perſuaſions;* or who repreſent this faith as conſiſting *only in an honeſt principle*, or in a *barren aſſent* to Chriſtianity, or as implying *both belief and practice*, and as *juſtifying only* as it thus *comprehends obedience* in *its nature?*

4. But our principal inquiry on this head yet remains; namely, Through what *means*, or on what *account*, we obtain juſtification before God?——Having ſhown what our church means by Juſtification, and what by Faith, and in what ſenſe ſhe conſiders Faith concerned in the tranſaction, and, as we conceive, proved our own perfect coincidence with her in theſe particulars, we are prepared for this further inveſtigation. Much indeed has already been advanced on the ſubject, in the illuſtration of theſe other points, but its high importance may warrant a more diſtinct diſcuſſion.

Our opinion then has been ſtated in the words of the article, "that we are juſtified BY FAITH ONLY, and ONLY FOR THE MERIT of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt." And if we cannot prove, beyond all reaſonable room for controverſy, that theſe are the unequivocal ſentiments of our Church and Reformers, we muſt renounce our claim to churchmanſhip for ever.

We will begin with obſerving upon this plain language of the article, and the obvious conſtruction of the whole article taken together. This, we ſee, is, that "we are accounted righteous," or juſtified, "before God, *only for*," in the Latin "propter," on account of, "the merit of our

Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and *not for*," propter, on account of, "our own works or deservings."——Language cannot well be clearer. The things opposed are, the merit of Christ, and our own works; and we are justified, it is affirmed, *only* on account of the former, and not, consequently *at all*, on account of our works.——But, it might be observed, we may be justified BY our works, although not *for* them; they may be the stipulated *condition* of justification although they do not *merit* it. No, replies the article, it is "BY *faith*." That is, adds some Dr. Croft or Mr. Daubeny, "*by faith and works together*." No, says the article, "we are justified *by faith* ONLY. It is not, we must carefully observe, *for* our faith, any more than *for* our works. The Latin is not *propter* fidem, but "*per* fidem, and *solâ* fide." This construction indeed would render the doctrine of the article nonsense, and flatly contradictory. Unless therefore the phrases "by faith," and "by faith only,' are thus understood, in contradistinction to *by works*, there is *no sense* in them, nor any reason why faith should have been mentioned. And the plain doctrine here taught is, that *Christ only* is the *meritorious* cause of our justification, and that *faith only* is the *mean by which we apprehend, and apply, and become interested in, his merits, for this* justification.

And this doctrine "that we are justified by faith only," it is added, "is a most wholsome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the homily of justification [f]." This, Dr. Hey allows, "expresses these things fully and clearly [g]." Here Bishop Horsley testifies, "these doctrines are delivered with admirable perspicuity and precision [h]." It is worthy of recollection also, that this homily, in particular, is known to have been written by Cranmer [i]. To the homilies upon these subjects, we therefore with pleasure next appeal.

(f) Art. 11. (g) Vol. iii. p. 270. (h) Charge, p. 28. (i) Strype's Life, p. 149.

"The very true meaning" then, we here read, "of this propoſition, or ſaying, we be juſtified by faith in Chriſt only, is this: We put our faith in Chriſt that we be juſtified by him only, that we be juſtified by God's free mercy, and the merits of our Saviour Chriſt only, and by no virtue or good works of our own that is in us, or that we can be able to have, or to do, for to deſerve the ſame: Chriſt himſelf only being the cauſe meritorious thereof [k]." And again, "This ſaying that we be juſtified by faith only, freely and without works, is ſpoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works, as being unable to deſerve our juſtification at God's hands, and . . . wholly to aſcribe the merit and deſerving of our juſtification unto Chriſt only [l]."——Theſe paſſages, with others that ſhall preſently be added, clearly eſtabliſh the doctrine of the article, that we are not juſtified *for* our own works; or, that works are in no reſpect the *meritorious* cauſe of our juſtification.

And, with equal clearneſs the point is here alſo confirmed, that we are not juſtified *for*, or in any reſpect on account of the MERIT of, our *faith*. "The true underſtanding of this doctrine, that we be juſtified by faith in Chriſt only," it is affirmed, "is not that this our own act to believe in Chriſt, or this our faith in Chriſt, which is within us, doth juſtify us, and *deſerve* our juſtification unto us, for that were to count ourſelves to be juſtified by ſome act or virtue that is within ourſelves, but the true underſtanding and meaning thereof is, that although we hear God's word and believe it, although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance, &c. within us, and do never ſo many works thereunto; yet we muſt renounce the merit of all our ſaid virtues of *faith* hope, charity, and all other virtues and good deeds, which we either have done, ſhall do, or can do, as things that be far too weak and inſufficient and imperfect, to deſerve remiſſion of our ſins, and our juſtification, and therefore we

(k) Hom. on Salvation, p. 16. (l) Ibid. p. 15.

muſt truſt only in God's mercy, and the ſacrifice of our High Prieſt Jeſus Chriſt. . . . . As great and as godly a virtue as the lively faith is, yet it putteth us from itſelf, and remitteth or appointeth us unto Chriſt, for to have only by him remiſſion of our ſins, or juſtification. . . . . Our faith, as it were, ſaith unto us, it is not *I* that take away your ſins, but it is Chriſt only, and to him only I ſend you for that purpoſe, *forſaking therein all your good virtues, words, thoughts, and works*, and only putting your truſt in Chriſt[m]." And again, after a moſt full declaration and diſcuſſion of our doctrine, that "only faith juſtifieth us," and that "faith without works juſtifieth;" it is added, "and becauſe all this is brought to paſs through the only merits and deſervings of our Saviour Chriſt, and not through our merits, or through the merit of any virtue that we have within us, or of any work that cometh from us; therefore in that reſpect of *merit and deſerving*, we forſake, as it were, all together again, *faith*, works, and all other virtues. For our own imperfection is ſo great, through the corruption of original ſin, that all is imperfect that is within us, *faith*, charity, hope, dread, thoughts, words, and works, and therefore not apt to *merit and deſerve any part* of our juſtification[n]."

In reſpect to *merit*, therefore, faith and works are manifeſtly here placed on the ſame footing. It is undeniably excluded from both. And the pretence which is ſo prevalent, that the expreſſions of our church "by faith only," "by faith without works, &c." mean only to exclude the *merit* of works in our juſtification, is, as was affirmed above, abſurd and nonſenſical. In this reſpect, it is obvious, we are equally juſtified *without faith*.——Faith and works therefore being thus equally excluded as meritorious cauſes of juſtification, what can theſe phraſes "by faith only," "by faith without works," &c. and the earneſtneſs with which our church inſiſts upon them, mean, but that faith only, or faith

(m) Ibid. p. 16. (n) Ibid. p. 17.

without works, is the *conditional* or *inſtrumental* cauſe of this bleſſing?

The way in which the homilies conſider *faith* immediately and peculiarly concerned in the tranſaction has been ſhown above[o]. This is, as it ſends us directly to Chriſt; as by it we embrace, receive, apply, &c. the merits of Chriſt to ourſelves.——And that, in the judgment of theſe umpires, we are juſtified in the ſight of God *by faith only*, thus underſtood, and not *by works*, nor *by faith and works together*, the following citations in addition to thoſe already produced, prove moſt demonſtrably.

Having quoted Romans iii. 23—25; x. 4; and viii. 2, 3; the homily proceeds thus: "In theſe foreſaid places, the Apoſtle toucheth eſpecially three things, which muſt go together in our juſtification: Upon God's part, his great mercy and grace; upon Chriſt's part, the ſatisfaction of God's juſtice; and upon our part, *true and lively faith* in the merits of Jeſus Chriſt, which yet is not ours, but by God's working in us[p]." And then, having obſerved that this mode of juſtification illuſtrates the juſtice as well as the grace of God, and "ſhutteth out the juſtice of man," it is added; "Therefore St. Paul declareth here *nothing upon the behalf of man* concerning his juſtification but *only a true and lively faith*, which nevertheleſs is the gift of God, and not man's only work without God: And yet that faith doth not ſhut out repentance, hope, love, &c. to be joined with faith in every man that is juſtified, but IT SHUTTETH THEM OUT FROM THE OFFICE OF JUSTIFYING: So that although they be all preſent together in him that is juſtified, yet they JUSTIFY NOT ALL TOGETHER[q]."

Can language be more expreſs upon any ſubject? The meaning however, we here ſee, and ſhall fully ſhow hereafter[z], is not, that works, the very beſt we can perform, are

(o) Page 195. (p) Hom. on Salvation, p. 13.
(q) Ibid. (z) See Chap. 7.

at any time to be omitted, or disregarded; "for we are most bounden," it is declared, "to serve God all the days of our life:" Much less is it intended, that being justified, "we should afterwards be idle;" or that any should consider themselves justified who are destitute of repentance, love, and obedience: But, the avowed meaning is, to exclude these and every kind of works, "so that we may not do them to *this intent, to be made just* by doing of them[r];" to show, that however good, and absolutely necessary on other accounts, these works may be, yet that because of their imperfection, and because God has so ordained, they have no part in this matter of our justification. This point the Homily certainly presses with great earnestness.

Having in the beginning of its second part recapitulated the substance of what had gone before, and which has here been adduced, and having cited several of the scriptures by which the doctrine is usually supported, it proceeds, "And to be short, the sum of all Paul's disputation is this, that if justice (righteousness or justification) come of works, then it cometh not of grace: And if it come of grace, then it cometh not of works. And to this end tend all the Prophets, as St. Peter saith in the tenth of the Acts. Of Christ all the Prophets, saith St. Peter, do witness, that through his name, all they that believe in him, shall receive the remission of sins. And after this wise to be justified only by this true and lively faith in Christ, speak all the old and ancient authors, both Greeks and Latins. Of whom I will especially rehearse three, Hilary, Basil, and Ambrose. St. Hilary saith these words . . , 'Faith only justifieth.' St. Basil . . . writeth thus, 'This is a perfect and whole rejoicing in God, when a man advanceth not himself for his own righteousness, but acknowledgeth himself to lack true justice and righteousness, and to be justified by the only faith in Christ. And Paul, saith he, doth glory in the contempt of his own righte-

(r) Hom. on Salvation, p. 13.

ouſneſs, and that he looketh for the righteouſneſs of God by faith.' And St. Ambroſe ſaith theſe words, 'This is the ordinance of God that they which *believe in Chriſt*, ſhould be *ſaved without works, by faith only, freely receiving* remiſſion of their ſins.'

"Conſider diligently" ſays the Homily, "theſe words, *without works, by faith only, freely* we receive remiſſion of our ſins. What can be ſpoken more plainly, than to ſay, that freely without works, by faith only, we obtain remiſſion of our ſins? Theſe and other like ſentences, that we be juſtified by faith only, freely, and without works, we do read oft-times in the beſt and moſt ancient writers. As beſide thoſe before rehearſed, in Origen, Chryſoſtom, Cyprian, Auguſtine, &c [s]."——And in the very ſame page, having extolled this doctrine, as thus approved "by all old and ancient authors of Chriſt's church;" as taught in the holy ſcripture; as the ſtrong rock and foundation of the Chriſtian religion; the homily adds, that "whoſoever denieth it, is not to be accounted for a Chriſtian man, nor for a ſetter forth of Chriſt's glory, but for an *adverſary to Chriſt and his goſpel.*"

Such is the "admirable perſpicuity and preciſion" with which the doctrine of juſtification by faith alone is taught in our Homilies. How then can any perſons of integrity and information, after duly attending to theſe diſcourſes, deny that this is the certain doctrine of our church, or attempt to explain her language ſo as to evade it?

The proof of the point is, however, by no means finiſhed here. That good works cannot, in her judgment, be either the *meritorious cauſe*, or the *ſtipulated condition* of juſtification, has often been juſtly argued from the language and tenour of the two ſucceeding articles [t]. Here it is maintained, that whatever works are done *before* juſtification, are not only devoid of every kind of merit, but that they "are not pleaſant

(s) Ibid. p. 14, 15. (t) 12, and 13.

to God, and have the *nature of ſin*;" and that "good works are the *fruits of faith*, and *follow after* juſtification."——To the ſame effect, "No man," ſaith the Homily on faſting, from St. Auſtin, "doeth good works to receive Grace by his good works, but becauſe he hath *firſt* received grace, therefore *conſequently* he doth good works. Good works *go not before* in him which ſhall afterwards be juſtified; but good works do *follow after*, when a man is firſt juſtified[v]." "However glorious," adds Archbiſhop Cranmer, "in the ſight of men, works done before juſtification may be, they are not allowed and accepted before God. Works only which follow juſtification pleaſe God, becauſe only after men are juſtified they begin to work as God's law requireth[w]." But, if good works are thus the *fruits of faith*, and only *follow after* juſtification; then they certainly cannot *go before* this bleſſing. Fruit certainly cannot exiſt prior to the tree which bears it, nor the effect antecedently to its cauſe. And if theſe works cannot precede juſtification, but are themſelves the fruits and conſequences of it, then they cannot be either the *cauſe* or *condition* of juſtification. Cauſes and conditions neceſſarily precede that of which they are the cauſes or conditions, and ſtand in direct oppoſition to the fruits and conſequences of it.

The Biſhops and Martyrs in priſon thus expreſs themſelves on the ſubject: "We believe and confeſs concerning juſtification, that as it cometh only from God's mercy through Chriſt, ſo it is perceived and had of none, who be of years of diſcretion, otherwiſe than *by faith* ONLY[x]." "He proveth," ſaith Biſhop Hooper, ſpeaking of St. Paul's reaſoning in Romans ix. "man to be ſaved only by mercy, for the merits of Chriſt; which is apprehended and received by faith[m]." "Our whole juſtification" Nowell's Catechiſm

(v) Page 174; ſee alſo Hom. an Alms-deeds, p. 247. (w) Diſcourſe on Juſtification. (x) Fox's Acts, &c. p. 1641. (m) Preface to Expo. of Decalogue.

proceeds, muſt be aſcribed to the merc yof God through Chriſt; which freely and graciouſly accepteth us in him, without any merit of ours, or any regard to our works [y]." "We cannot," it ſays again, "by any works or merits of ours prevent God, and firſt movehim to be propitious to us; but the fount and origin of our juſtification is his love, and election of us, in Chriſt [z]." This bleſſing he alſo teaches we obtain "by faith;" but in nowiſe "for the merit of faith [a]." ——"Faith," continues Biſhop Jewel, from St. Auſtin, "had in the ſacraments, doth juſtify, and not the ſacraments. And Chriſt," he immediately adds from Origen, "is the prieſt, the propitiation, and ſacrifice; which propitiation cometh to every one by the mean of faith [b]."

The ſame is the undoubted doctrine of the Augſburg Confeſſion. It is here taught, "Quod homines non poſſint juſtificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, ſed gratis juſtificentur propter Chriſtum per fidem, cùm credunt ſe in gratiam recipi, et peccata remitti propter Chriſtum, qui ſua morte pro noſtris peccatis ſatisfecit. Hanc fidem imputat Deus pro juſtitia coram ipſo [c]." Again: "Tantùm fide apprehenditur remiſſio peccatorum ac gratia.... Remiſſio peccatorum et juſtificatio fide apprehenditur, ſicut teſtatur et vox Chriſti: Cùm feceritis hæc omnia, dicite, ſervi inutiles ſumus. Idem docent et veteres Scriptores Eccleſiaſtici. Ambroſius enim inquit: Hoc conſtitutum eſt à Deo, ut, qui credit in Chriſtum, ſalvus ſit, ſine opere, ſola fide, gratis accipiens remiſſionem peccatorum [d]."——In the Edition quoted in the Harmony in Engliſh, the *merit* of faith is alſo thus excluded: "We do not mean when we ſay, we are juſtified by faith, that we are *juſt* for the worthineſs of that virtue; but this is our meaning, that we obtain remiſſion of ſins and imputation of righteouſneſs by mercy ſhowed us for Chriſt's ſake: But now this mercy cannot be

(y) Page 110. (z) Page 113. (a) Page 111. (b) Apology, p. 73. (c) Art. 4. (d) Art. 20, and 6.

received but *by faith*." They are treated as enemies and heterodox who "teach not that we do *by faith alone* undoubtedly receive remiſſion of ſins for Chriſt's ſake." "And for any" it is added, "to deſpiſe or miſlike this doctrine, as detracting from good works," or under any other pretence, "is more than phariſaical blindneſs."

Preciſely ſimilar alſo are the ſentiments of Mr. Hooker. "The righteouſneſs," ſays this approved Divine, "wherein we muſt be found, if we will be juſtified is not our own; therefore we cannot be juſtified by any inherent quality: Chriſt hath merited righteouſneſs for as many as are found in him. In him God findeth us if we be faithful; for *by faith* we are incorporated into Chriſt [e]." In the opinion of the great Luther, "the attention ſhown to this doctrine is the ſure mark of a ſtanding or a falling church [g]."

A whole body of further evidence equally expreſs on the point, from the Works of Latimer, Hooper, Taylor, Jewel, &c. ſhall be omitted as wholly unneceſſary. For, as Biſhop Horſley teſtifies, "That man is JUSTIFIED BY FAITH, WITHOUT THE WORKS OF THE LAW, was the UNIFORM DOCTRINE of the FIRST REFORMERS. It is," his Lordſhip adds, "a far more ancient doctrine: it was the doctrine of the whole College of Apoſtles. It is more ancient ſtill: it was the doctrine of the Prophets. It is older than the Prophets: it was the religion of the Patriarchs. . . . It is the very corner-ſtone of the whole ſyſtem of Redemption [h]." Or, if the evidence of Biſhop Warburton be preferred, this is, that the redemption of mankind by Chriſt, "together with its conſequent doctrine of JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE, were the great *goſpel-principles* on which PROTESTANTISM was founded [i]."

So perfectly, ſo uniformly, ſo undoubtedly, do the ſentiments of our church and her moſt eminent early writers,

(e) Diſcourſe on Juſtifica. p. 20. (g) See his Sentiments at large on this ſubject in his Comment on the Galatians. (h) Charge, p. 26, 6. (i) On Grace, p. 316.

coincide with thoſe which we maintain on this doctrine. Let the moſt ingenious of our opponents fairly prove the contrary. Let them adduce any ſuch evidence in proof of *their* agreement with her.

But how can they reconcile all this with the notions *they* hold on the ſubject?——Their own *Conceſſions* ſhow pretty clearly that, after all their endeavours, the thing is impoſſible. Thus, the famous Dr. Bennet, commenting on the article upon the ſubject, inſtead of *agreeing* with her, tells us, that "Our Church's intention and doctrine about juſtification by faith . . . are *unhappily worded;*" and that "*the compilers of our articles and homilies do not ſeem thoroughly to have underſtood St. Paul*" on this doctrine, . . . "as later writers have evidently ſhown[l]!"——Dr. Croft claſſes this doctrine with thoſe of the deſcent into Hell, and Predeſtination; concerning which, either ſome *new interpretation* obtains, or ſomething is "*now clearly proved* by Dr. Tucker and Dr. Paley;" and he thinks that if our Superiors interfere at all, in regard to the articles, "they might explain the nature of Juſtification by faith[m]." As if a large Homily written by Archbiſhop Cranmer for this expreſs purpoſe, with ſuch "admirable perſpicuity and preciſion," and all the other public writings of the church were inſufficient; as if any perſon of common ſenſe could doubt reſpecting her ſentiments. The ſuggeſtion can only imply that Dr. C. diſapproves of her preſent mode of explaining this doctrine.

And, to omit all others, the ingenious Dr. Hey is compelled to make conceſſions on the point. The Reformers, he plainly teaches, in the heat of their diſpute with the Romaniſts, went too far in depreciating good works, and extolling "the neceſſity of founding all pretenſions to reward, on the merits of Chriſt[n]:" And our church, he owns, "fell

(l) Directions, &c. p. 82. (m) Strictures on Paley, &c. p. 58, 63 (n) Vol. iii. p. 261.

in with the reformed [o]," on this doctrine. But, "the Reformed," he obſerves, "have departed ſo much from the rigour of their doctrine about faith, and the Romaniſts from theirs about good works, that there ſeems now very little difference between them[p]." "Nothing," he ſays, "was more natural than running into the oppoſite extreme," after the Reſtoration; "for ſome aſcribed even the political confuſions, previous to the Reſtoration, to the great ſtreſs laid on the doctrine of Juſtification by faith" "Nevertheleſs, . . . men did not fairly get into the oppoſite extreme until the beginning of the eighteenth Century [q]." "Juſtification by faith," he alſo ſays, "is one doctrine by which Antinomians are moſt diſtinguiſhed [r]." He "knows not whether the expreſſions of our Homilies on the ſubject" of good works, "are not ſomewhat too ſtrong" for him [s]; and he talks of making "our article (on Juſtification) more acceptable by ſoftening ſome expreſſions ſeemingly *tending to Antinomianiſm*, and by ſtrengthening expreſſions tending to encourage virtue, and the hopes of its rewards [t]."——This ſurely is not the language of thoſe who are quite ſatisfied with the church on this doctrine, and who cordially and ſtrictly adhere to her.—But let us adduce a few ſpecimens of this boaſted adherence.

Few words will ſuffice to ſhow the abſurdity of this pretenſion in thoſe who hold the Socinian notion of two juſtifications, and that all the juſtification attainable in this world, is ſynonimous to baptiſm, or our admiſſion into the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. This ends at once all diſpute about faith and works on the point, in reſpect to the generality of our communion, who are baptized in their infancy when both are equally impoſſible. And certainly it is not our juſtification at the day of judgment the church has imme-

(o) Ibid. p. 272. (p) Ibid. p. 262. (q) Ibid. p. 265.
See alſo above, p. 31. (r) Vol. iii. p. 264. (s) Ibid. p. 375.
(t) Ibid. p. 283.

diately in view. She would ſcarcely be ſo minute in diſtinguiſhing what ſort of works and fruits they are which *follow after* our juſtification then; and affirm that whatever is done before that period is not pleaſant to God, but has the nature of ſin. Beſides, this ſecond juſtification, they teach, is wholly by works; but that of which the church is treating, is only by faith. But, as was obſerved above, this diſtinction, and theſe notions, muſt be ſought for elſewhere than in the legitimate writings of the Church of England.

But neither are theſe Divines Proteſtants enough wholly to exclude OUR OWN MERITS in this matter of our juſtification before God. The profeſſedly orthodox Dr. Carr teaches, "that we are ſafe under the ſhadow of God's wings, ſo long as we endeavour to *deſerve* his favour and protection [v]." Mr. Clapham hopes his Congregation "will *recommend* themſelves to the favour of God, . . . by a regular attendance upon Divine Ordinances, and an uniform practice of religious precepts [w]."—Dr. Hey, treating of the way in which the pardon of ſin is obtained, ſays, "Repentance, I doubt not, always *avails ſomething* in the ſight of God [x]." Speaking of "natural virtue," he obſerves, "It may be inſufficient to ſerve as the ground of a ſtrict claim upon God; but it may nevertheleſs be a great *recommendation* to God [y]."—Mr. Daubeny, although, on ſome occaſions, he verbally diſclaims it, is juſtly chargeable with the ſame doctrine. Thus, in vindication of his own notions, he produces a paſſage from the 'Erudition of a Chriſtian man,' which ſays expreſsly, that Good Works "be MERITORIOUS towards the attaining of everlaſting life [z]!" And, if there is any meaning in the uſe he makes of Revelations iii. 4; and xxii. 14, it muſt be ſomething of this kind. He talks of "works," "obedience to the moral law," as conſtituting men "relatively *worthy*;" and giving them as he

(v) Ser. 1. p. 10. (w) Thankſgiving Sermon, 1797. p. 24.
(x) Vol. iii. p. 311. (y) Ibid. p. 222. (z) Appendix, p. 329.

explains the latter of these scriptures, "a right of grace on the part of God," to the tree of life; and of God becoming their "debtor[a]." A right of grace, and God "man's debtor," in consequence of his obedience to the moral law! for this is what Mr. D. is enforcing. This surely is strange, if not utterly incomprehensible doctrine! The Apostle however, is very intelligible and express on the subject. "To him that worketh," he allows, "the reward is not reckoned of Grace, but of Debt." "But if it be of Works," he adds, "then it is no more Grace. And if by Grace then is it no more of Works[b]."

The Reverend Mr. Nelson, speaking of "Grace," observes, "As it is not given when not wanted, so it is vouchsafed to those only who DESERVE it; and when, by their vicious conduct, men render themselves *unworthy* of the favour, it is then withdrawn and withheld from them[c]." This is the doctrine of his "Treatise on Inspiration;" recommended in Newspapers[z], like certain other *precious* Articles, as nearly essential to the salvation of all Families. And, on being reminded that this doctrine does not seem exactly to harmonize with that of the church, Mr. N. in what he calls "A Defence" of his Work, answers thus: "In the above passage, I am to be understood, as speaking of Grace, not before, but after it is received; and my meaning is, that, as it is at first given to those whose minds are fit to receive it, *so it is continued to those only* who, in the gracious eye of Heaven, *continue to deserve it;* or, in other words, who are deemed *deserving* of it[d]!" Some persons will perhaps think that Mr. N.'s Cure is, at least as bad, as his Disease.—"The gospel of Christ," Mr. Fellowes adds, "is, from beginning to end, nothing more than a rule of life; teaching us how to live so as to please God and to be *worthy* of immortality[z]." ——Mr. Benson also speaks out. His avowed object in

(a) Guide, p. 287, 288, 289. (b) Rom. iv. 4; xi. 6. (c) Page 3. (z) See the York Chronicle, 1799. (d) Page 6. (z) Anti-Cal. p. 12.

preaching is, to perſuade his audience "to become *worthy* of election [e]." "If," he ſays, repelling the charge of ſome audacious oppoſer of his ſyſtem, "we are accuſed of recommending the practice of moral virtues, as *neceſſary conditions*, whereby we may through faith in him who promiſeth, *render ourſelves worthy* the mediation of our Saviour; as we ſtrenuouſly aſſert the doctrine, ſo alſo we glory in the charge [f]." He urges "the neceſſity of *recommending* ourſelves to the mercy of God, and *rendering ourſelves worthy* the mediation of Jeſus Chriſt by holineſs of living, and by an abhorrence of vice [g]."

And now, how can any perſons, endowed with ordinary integrity and diſcernment, who uſe this language, pretend to agree with the ſtandard writings of our church? If it is not clear from the above extracts, that all MERIT, DESERT, and WORTHINESS, on the part of man, in all ſenſes, is there excluded, in reſpect to his acceptance with God, there is certainly no meaning in words.

It may be further affirmed, of a large claſs of theſe profeſſed adherents to our articles, that they certainly teach the doctrine of juſtification *by works*. Theſe they repreſent as the condition of it, and as the chief means by which we muſt obtain it. "We are required," Dr. Croft ſays, "to conſider Good Works as the *Condition*, but not the meritorious cauſe of ſalvation [h]." "Were we," ſays Mr. Benſon to his congregation, "to utter thoſe preſſing calls, which elſewhere you may hear . . . ; 'Come to Chriſt, and throw yourſelves on his mercy. Come to him bringing nothing but your ſins. . . . Seek him *not by your deeds*, but ſeek him by faith. Were we, I ſay, to call you in ſuch terms, we ſhould but turn conſpirators againſt the welfare of your ſouls." . . . "The call you deſire to hear is uttered *only to the righteous*. . . . He (Chriſt) calls, he ſpeaks comfort to, *the*

(e) Ser. i. p. 8. (f) Ibid. p. 13. (g) Ibid. p. 19.
(h) Strictures on Paley, &c. p. 60.

righteous [i]." Does not the Saviour himself affirm the direct contrary [k]?

Very similar is the Theology of Bishop Watson. To his Author, Bishop Fowler, it appears self-evident, that "None but *holy* souls are capable of remission of sin [l]!"——"Those persons," Mr. Fellowes says, who, among their other extravagancies, "expect *justification* upon *easier conditions than those of good works*, will find themselves miserably and fatally deluded [z]." "As," he observes, "the corruptions with which the gospel has been intermingled, by the fraud of some, and the ignorance of others, shall be purged away, Christianity will become again, as it was at the beginning, nothing more than a rule of life. The practice of its duties will be the test of faith, the standard of interest, and the *only condition* on the performance of which immortality will be expected [y]."

The divinity provided for the Clergy by Dr. Burn, Chancellor of the Diocese of Carlisle, is such as the following. "The laws" of the Gospel, "never promise any thing but to obedience [m]." "No man will be acquitted at the day of judgment, but only for working and obeying [n]." The inquiry will be only, whether we have done what was commanded us? If we have, we shall be pronounced righteous, and sentenced to eternal life: if we have wilfully transgressed and wrought wickedness without amendment and repentance, to everlasting death [o]." "There is no pardon to be purchased without obedience [p]." "Our obedience is that only thing which will be admitted as a *just plea*; and as a qualification able to save us in the last day [q]." Nor is it obedience taken in an extensive sense, as consisting especially in believing in him whom God hath

(i) Ser. i. p. 14—18. (k) Mat. ix. 13. (l) Tracts, Vol. vi. p. 322. (z) Anti-cal. p. 14. (y) Ibid. p. 27. See also Mr. Haggitt, p. 6—8. (m) Sermons, Vol. i. p. 2. (n) Ibid. p. 5. (o) Ibid. p. 9. (p) Ser. 8. p. 144. (q) Ser. i. p. 11.

ſent, that is here chiefly meant; but obedience to the moral law, obedience as diſtinct from faith. This is clear from what follows. Having obſerved how fatally "men evade this doctrine, becauſe the goſpel promiſes ſalvation to faith, love, being in hriſt, &c.;" *Theſe*, he ſays, "ſave us no otherwiſe than by being ſprings and principles of our obedience. . . So that firſt or laſt, *obedience* is . . . that *alone condition* which our judge will accept, and which we may ſafely truſt to[r]." Accordingly, Mr. Polwhele exhorts "us all to be aware, whatever our tenets may be, that nothing can afford us comfort, at the hour of death, but the conſciouſneſs of having 'done juſtice, loved mercy, and walked humbly with our God[s].'"

And is not this alſo the notorious Divinity of Mr. Daubeny? The benefits of Chriſt and Faith, according to his phraſeology, are, "Redemption from a ſtate of certain condemnation, and a reſtoration to a ſtate of *poſſible* ſalvation; together with a gracious proviſion of aſſiſtance to make that ſalvation ſure[t]." Theſe benefits he conſiders as enjoyed by all the profeſſed members of the Church of England[v]. "But whether," he ſays, "this ſtate of *poſſible* ſalvation through Chriſt, may become a ſtate of *actual* ſalvation to the *believing party*, muſt depend upon the uſe made of the means vouchſafed for that purpoſe[w]." Again, having obſerved that Chriſt has only placed man "in a ſalvable condition," the Clergy, he ſays, "feel themſelves called upon to *enforce obedience to the moral law*, as neceſſary to the accompliſhment of the Chriſtian ſcheme; neceſſary to bring fallen man into a *ſtate of acceptance* with God, by qualifying him for the ſalvation which has been purchaſed[x]."——"Works", he ſays again, "ſhould be preſſed upon Chriſtians at all times as the *condition* upon which they are taught to look for

(r) Ser. 1. p. 11. (s) Letter, p. 90. (t) Guide, p. 299.
(v) Ibid; and p. 309; and paſſim. (w) Page 299. (x) Page 287.

ſalvation [y]:" and on another occaſion, " They (i. e. Works) will be *conſiderations on account of which* God will be pleaſed *to accept* a fallen, condemned, though, at the ſame time, repentant and obedient ſinner, for the ſake of what an all-gracious Saviour has done and ſuffered for him [z]."

The ſum of Mr. D.'s doctrine then, as far as it is at all intelligible, is this; that admiſſion into Chriſtianity by faith, places men in a ſtate of poſſible ſalvation; but that whether this becomes a real, actual, and diſcriminating ſalvation to any believer, depends *wholly upon his works;* whether he is really brought " into a ſtate of acceptance with God," depends wholly on his " obedience to the moral law." Works therefore are clearly made the grand hinge on which our juſtification and ſalvation turn. All the ſalvation by which true Chriſtians are diſtinguiſhed from the wicked is founded on their *own obedience.*

And is it not now aſtoniſhing, that perſons aſſuming the high office of Guardians of our literature and eſtabliſhed Theology, ſhould affirm, that the doctrines of Mr. D.'s Guide " are *ſtrictly conformable* to the articles and liturgy of the Church of England, *particularly* in the two great points of election and *juſtification* [a]! Is it not aſtoniſhing that any perſons of ſenſe and character ſhould pretend that all this is adherence to the doctrine of our church! Theſe teachers, thus in effect, make WORKS *every thing*, or at the leaſt, the grand turning point, in the matter of our ſalvation: Our church calls upon us to " conſider diligently, that they who believe in Chriſt, are SAVED WITHOUT WORKS, BY FAITH ONLY, freely receiving the remiſſion of their ſins." They teach that in order to obtain pardon, and acceptance with God, we muſt be thus " righteous," " holy," " qualified" by our " obedience to the moral law," and perform all theſe " conditions" of good works: Her uniform doctrine is, that

---

(y) Page 288. (z) Appendix, p. 328. (a) See Antijac. Review for Jan. 1800, p. 14.

"faith only juſtifieth;" that in applying to God for this bleſſing we "muſt forſake all our good virtues, works, &c;" that we muſt not do any works "to this intent to be made juſt by doing of them;" nay, that we cannot, till *after we are juſtified*, do a good work.

Another opinion, of the ſame kind, which theſe Theologians maintain, is, "That faith in the merits of Chriſt *ſupplies the defects* of our obedience;" and that "for the ſake of Chriſt *ſincerely righteous* perſons are treated as if they were *perfectly* ſo. So teaches Biſhop Watſon[b] from Mr. Locke and Biſhop Fowler. Dr. Hey ſays, "The merits of Chriſt ſupply imperfection[c]." Mr. Deaſon, whoſe divinity was honoured with a prize in the Univerſity, tells us, "Chriſt died more particularly to *make perfect* by his own ſufferings, the obedience of ſuch as may have been almoſt inadvertent or caſual ſinners[d]." "Nothing," Dr. Burn adds, "leſs than this performance of our duty can avail us unto life; and by the merits of Chriſt, and the grace of his goſpel, this will[e]." And the ſame might be ſhown to be the notion of moſt of the writers juſt mentioned.

Of this opinion it has often been juſtly obſerved, that, in effect, it deſtroys both the law and the goſpel; by reducing the former to a mere vague indeterminate ſomething, named *Sincerity;* and, both in regard to the honour of God and the comfort of man, robbing the latter of all its glory. The Advocates of this ſyſtem have alſo, with propriety, often been called upon to ſhow where in the New Teſtament this doctrine is found; where it is there taught that our own righteouſneſs perfected by Chriſt's is accepted for our juſtification, or that his merits only ſupply the defects of our obedience? It is however ſufficient to our preſent purpoſe to obſerve, that it is clearly very different from the preceding repreſentations of the church; namely, that "without the

(b) Tracts, Vol. iv. p. 93 and Vol. vi. p. 392. (c) Vol. iii. p. 355. (d) Eſſay on Juſtification. (e) Ser. i. p. 8.

grace of God by Chriſt *preventing* us, we have no power to do good works," and that "we are accounted righteous before God ONLY for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt by faith."

But, to proceed to the doctrine of the moſt orthodox of theſe Divines, at their moſt orthodox moments; this is, that we are juſtified *by faith and good works together;* or, as they expreſs it, that faith and good works are the *Conditions* of our juſtification. Little need be advanced in ſupport of this aſſertion, the matter of it will be ſo generally avowed. Thus, Mr. Gray, treating on the doctrine of juſtification, ſays, Our church differs "from the Calviniſts, in conſidering Good Works not merely as effects, but as *co-efficient conditions* with Faith[f]." Mr. Foley adds, "The Chriſtian religion is founded on a mutual covenant between the Creator and the Creature. *Faith and good works* are the *conditions*, ſalvation the reward of obedience[g]." Mr. Daubeny expreſſes the doctrine fully. Having mentioned the part which, he conceives, belongs excluſively to God in the act of man's juſtification; "the other parts of the goſpel covenant," he ſays, "as *faith, repentance, and good works* through the operation of the Spirit, are the CONDITIONS upon which God engages to vouchſafe that JUSTIFICATION to him[h]." Again, "Good Works," he ſays, "are neceſſary as *parts of the condition* upon which the free grace of God has been ſuſpended[i]." And, to be conciſe where the caſe is ſo clear, the learned Biſhop Bull, to whom Mr. Daubeny refers as having ſtated this ſubject ſo clearly as to render further diſcuſſion uſeleſs[k]; whoſe Pupil Mr. D. is conſidered by the Britiſh Critic; and to whoſe Divinity the moſt orthodox of our opponents would, doubtleſs, ſubſcribe;

(f) Bamp. Lect. p. 246, Note. (g) See A Defence of the Church of England, by the Rev. R. Foley, M. A. Sermon vi. (h) Guide, p. 311. (i) Appendix, p. 173. (k) See Guide, p. 312.

ſpeaks thus upon it. " A man is ſaid, ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦσθαι, to be *juſtified by works*, becauſe GOOD WORKS ARE THE CONDITION, according to the Divine appointment, eſtabliſhed in the goſpel covenant *requiſite* and *neceſſary to his juſtification*; that is, to his *obtaining remiſſion of ſins* through Chriſt, and *acceptance* into the Divine favour [1]." In attempting to prove this poſition a little after, he ſays, " The firſt claſs of theſe teſtimonies ſhall be thoſe which ſpeak of *Good Works* in a general ſenſe as the *requiſite and neceſſary condition of juſtification*." And then, having cited ſeveral paſſages from the word of God, " Who," he aſks, " does not believe that in theſe ſcriptures there is an *abundance of good works required*, which if a man do not perform he is altogether excluded from the hope of pardon and remiſſion of ſins?"

But is this indeed the doctrine of our Church? Is this language congenial with what we have produced from her writings on the ſubject? Surely it muſt require no ordinary courage to maintain this. If her doctrine indeed is, that we are thus juſtified *by faith and good works*; or that faith and good works are thus the *conditions of juſtification*, is it not very ſtrange that in none of her expreſs writings on the ſubject ſhe ſhould have affirmed this? And is there a ſingle expreſſion that ſounds like it, or that can be fairly conſtrued into it, either in her Articles or Homilies on the point? Let the Advocates of the doctrine produce it. On the contrary, does ſhe not in the moſt explicit, uniform, poſitive, and earneſt manner, *reject* this ſyſtem, and maintain the very oppoſite one? In reſpect to *merit*, ſhe places, we have ſeen, Faith and Works preciſely on the ſame footing; and aſcribes this, wholly, in all ſenſes, to our Redeemer: and then, when treating directly on the *means*, or *condition*, or whatever it is called, by which we obtain juſtification, ſhe ſays, " It is BY FAITH ONLY;" " by faith WITHOUT WORKS;" by faith

(1) Bull. Harmon. Apoſt. Cap. i. § 8. and quoted by Mr. Daubeny.

as it is perfectly distinct from obedience to the law, namely, "as it directly sends us to, and embraces Christ." She affirms, expressly and repeatedly, that in this act of approaching the Saviour for justification, "we must *forsake*, or leave behind us, all our supposed good virtues;" "that we must not do good works to the *intent to be made just* by doing of them;" that whatever *good works are joined with faith* in every man that is justified, "it SHUTTETH THEM OUT FROM THE OFFICE OF JUSTIFYING;" that "however *good works and faith* be present together in him that is justified, yet that THEY JUSTIFY NOT ALL TOGETHER." She shows, that she considers it as impossible for good works to be a *condition* of justification, as it is for the effect to precede its cause, by constantly representing these works as the *fruits* and *effects* of justification.

But we must not here repeat the whole body of her evidence to the same purport. Enough must have been said to convince all impartial judges, that even this most favourable ground of our opponents is not fairly tenable; and that on this most important of all doctrines, they do not, as they would pretend, teach, as it is taught in the standard writings of our church, and was taught by our Reformers.

Whether regard is had to the *nature* of justification, to the nature and province of *justifying faith*, or to the *means* by which justification is obtained, their *deviation* from this acknowledged standard, and our *strict adherence* to it, are thus equally conspicuous.——Our position therefore, we conceive, is again established on a double basis; and *that* of our opponents doubly overthrown. But whether our premises warrant this conclusion; or whether, at any rate, our claim to Churchmanship on this point is not the best founded of the two, let every competent judge decide.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAP. VII.

The queſtion of adherence purſued in reſpect to the doctrine of GOOD WORKS; *with a vindication of our tenets on this head.*

BUT let us purſue this inveſtigation of particulars to the doctrine of Good Works, or Chriſtian Morality, concerning which ſo much has already incidently been ſaid.

This then, it muſt be remarked, is the point in which we are ſuppoſed unqueſtionably the moſt vulnerable. It is chiefly from a reſpect to their bearings here, that the objections to our other doctrines would be underſtood to originate. The moſt open clamour, the moſt frequent inſinuation, againſt our whole ſyſtem, is, that we *depreciate good morals* [a]. Becauſe we exclude morality from the office of juſtifying, it is ſagaciously concluded, that we muſt either deny its neceſſity; or, at the leaſt, greatly underrate its value; as if becauſe we ſhould maintain that our eyes cannot perform the functions of our hands, we ſhould deny the neceſſity or depreciate the value of our eyes. Juſt ſo it was argued by the rigidly virtuous Papiſts againſt the doctrines of the Reformers [b]. And the ſame objection, under a little more diſguiſe, is preferred by the ſame kind of

(a) See Antijac. Review for April, 1799, p. 368; and for May, p. 77; Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 264, 296, 332; Review of Policy, &c. p. 22—32; Mr. Clapham's Sermon, p. 16, 17, 21; Mr. Haggitt's, p. 16, and Preface, p. 15; Mr. Fellowes', p. 12, and Preface; Mr. Daubeny's Appendix, p. 330; &c. (b) See Jewel's Apology; and the Corpus Confeſſionum, paſſim; the Homily on Faſting, p. 174; and Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 292.

perſons, againſt the Church herſelf. This undoubtedly is implied in the affirmation of Dr. Croft, that her "Articles concerning Grace, Faith, and Good Works lean towards the ſide of Enthuſiaſm [c]." This clearly is expreſſed in their conceſſions already noticed [d], that "the Reformers went too far in *depreciating good works*; that the compilers of our eleventh article *miſunderſtood St. Paul*; that the expreſſions of the homily about works are ſomewhat too ſtrong; that the article might be made more acceptable by ſoftening ſome expreſſions ſeemingly *tending to Antinomianiſm*; and by ſtrengthening expreſſions tending to encourage virtue, and the hopes of its rewards;" &c. &c.

We are in good company therefore, it appears, under our reproach. The charge however is a ſerious one, and would deſerve, could it be ſubſtantiated, the moſt ſerious attention. Were it indeed true that our doctrines, or thoſe of the Church, either in their natural tendency, or ordinary effect, encourage men in ſin, no reprobation could be too ſevere for them. But "audi alteram partem;" let not a concluſion be formed too haſtily. Our main buſineſs indeed is, not ſo much to vindicate, as to inveſtigate, the doctrines of the Church, and to ſhow whoſe opinions moſt reſemble them; but in this inſtance in attempting the one object, we ſhall alſo achieve the other.

SECTION I.

Concerning the Standard of Morals.

WE will begin with the *Standard or Rule* of morality which the Church of England preſcribes. This is the *whole moral law of God*. "No Chriſtian man whatever,"

(c) Bamp. Lect. p. 110. (d) Above, p. 208, 209.

ſhe affirms, "is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral[e]." The ſummary of this law therefore, the Decalogue, ſhe incorporates with her ordinary ſervice. What ſhe underſtands is implied in this divine Code, her catechiſm informs us; and ſhe may challenge any human compoſition whatever to furniſh a compendium of moral duty more conciſe and more complete; more pure, ſimple, and truly ſcriptural. The *firſt* of two chief things enjoined by this law, in cloſe imitation of the Saviour, ſhe here teaches, is, "Our duty towards God." This ſhe ſays, is, "To believe in him, to fear him, and to love him with all our heart, with all our mind, with all our ſoul, and with all our ſtrength; to worſhip him, to give him thanks, to put our whole truſt in him, to call upon him, to honour his holy Name and his Word, and to ſerve him truly all the days of our life." And what ſhe more preciſely means by this deſcription of duty, is ſhown at large in the homily on Chriſtian Love and Charity. Here it is repreſented to imply abſolute dependence upon God, a ſupreme affection for him, complacency in him as our chief Good, and the unreſerved devotion of all our powers, both of body and ſoul, to his ſervice, and to the advancement of his glory. "*This*," ſhe ſays, "is the *firſt and principal* part of charity[f]." So in the homily on Salvation, our duty, ſhe teaches, is, thus to devote our whole lives and powers to God, and "to ſeek in all things, and above all things, his glory and honour[g]." She ſpeaks too, of ſetting our minds "to ſerve God for his *own ſake*;" and conſtantly, of loving our neighbour "for God's ſake[h]."

Her members pray accordingly, before the repetition of this holy law, that God may "cleanſe the thoughts of their hearts," that they "may perfectly love him, and worthily

(e) Art. vii.; and Catechiſm. (f) See p. 36. (g) Page 19. (h) See Hom. on faith, p. 25; Hom. on Salva. p. 19; Hom. on Good Works, p. 35.

magnify his holy name." Her communicants "offer and preſent unto him, themſelves, their ſouls and bodies, to be a reaſonable, holy, and lively ſacrifice unto him." Her whole ſervice abounds with hymns of adoration of him, and aſcriptions of glory to him.

It is moſt clear therefore, without further evidence, that, in the judgment of our Church, the *firſt and chief* part of Chriſtian morality has a *direct and immediate reſpect to God.* It is the reaſonable ſervice we owe him; the juſt tribute he demands of us, as the glorious Sovereign of the Univerſe, as our Creator, Preſerver, and Redeemer. "Our *firſt* duty," ſhe conceives, as a celebrated Expoſitor of human laws alſo avers, "is unqueſtionably a duty to God [i]."

The *ſecond* chief thing taught in the decalogue, which the Church notices, is, "Our duty towards our neighbour." This, ſtill adhering cloſe to our Lord, ſhe ſays, is, "to love him as ourſelf;" and, of courſe, in every relation, and under every circumſtance, to act towards him accordingly. This conduct, as it reſpects both the relative, ſocial, and perſonal duties, ſhe diſtinctly ſpecifies in her comment on the ſix laſt commandments. Theſe duties ſhe notices, and illuſtrates in all their variety of bearings and relations, in her other writings. Thus, they are again diſtinctly enumerated in the Homily on Good Works; and the moſt conſcientious obſervance of them is enforced, as what we are bound unto "by God's commandments [k]." That the exerciſe of this love and beneficence muſt extend to enemies as well as friends, and triumph over every poſſible oppoſition on their part, is particularly ſhown, both from the precept and example of Chriſt, in the Sermon on Charity [l]. And, in the Homily on Salvation, this duty, ſhe ſays, is, "to be ever ready, for God's ſake, to give our-

(i) See Lord Kenyon's Addreſs to the Jury in the Caſe of the Rev. Mr. Blake, Vicar of St. Leonard, Shoreditch, London, May, 1799.
(k) Page 35. (l) Page 37, 38.

ſelves to our neighbours, and as much as lieth in us, to ſtudy with all our endeavour, to do goood to every man [m]."

The ſum of our Church's doctrine reſpecting our neighbour then is this: She prohibits us in every reſpect, and in every degree, from *injuring* any fellow creature; ſhe enjoins us, chiefly from a regard to God, to render unto all, their due degree of affection, honour, ſervice, and kindneſs; and, by every means afforded by our reſpective talents and ſtations, to *ſeek the happineſs of all men*, our families, our country, the whole human race.

How ſtrongly ſhe inſiſts on the converſion and regulation of the *heart*, as well as the external conduct, in her ſcheme of morals, appeared under our head Repentance [n]. There too it was manifeſt that ſhe accepts of no *partial* obedience, of no compoſition or compliance with one duty for the allowed breach of another, but inſiſts upon an uniform reſpect to every commandment.——In ſhort, the morality which our church requires, is, an exact conformity of heart and practice to the holy Will of God as revealed in his Word; or, that "we be made like the image of his Only-begotten Son, Jeſus Chriſt [o]."

2. And, preciſely the ſame is the Rule of moral duty uniformly taught by *us*. This ſupreme love of God, and ſtrict attention to the duties of the firſt Table; this love of man, and conſcientious diſcharge of every relative and perſonal duty, chiefly for God's ſake and from a regard to his authority; this manifeſtation of our philanthropy, by a diffuſive beneficence, apportioned to all according to their reſpective diſtances from us; this rectification of the heart and principle as well as the outward conduct; this uniform attention to *every part* of the divine Code (the whole ſtand-

(m) Page 19. (n) Above, p. 171—174. (o) Art. 17; Hom. on falling from God, p. 48.

ing upon the ſame authority) is the morality we conſtantly inculcate. In other words, this holy, and juſt, and good law of God, in its perfection, as a tranſcript of the divine Image, as originally written on man's heart, and as exemplified in the conduct of our Saviour, is the common ſtandard by which we determine what Chriſtian morality is, and the common rule by which, we teach, men ought to walk.

This law, we conceive, as Mr. Scott expreſſes it, "has its foundation in the nature of God and man, in the relations men bear to him and to each other, and in the obligations that reſult from them: ſo that it is immutable in its nature, and demands obedience from all mankind, as far as they have an opportunity of becoming acquainted with it [p]." However, the ſame Divine teaches, ſome circumſtances relative to this law may be varied, "the love of God with all the powers of the ſoul, and the equal love of each other, muſt continue the indiſpenſable duty of all reaſonable creatures [q]." This law, Mr. S. alſo ſays, "is ſpiritual; it takes cognizance of our inmoſt and moſt ſecret thoughts, deſires, purpoſes, and diſpoſitions, and demands the exact regulation of the judgment, will, and affections.... It requires entire, uninterrupted, and perpetual obedience... From the entrance to the cloſe of life the Lord enjoins upon us, exact conformity to every precept: every omiſſion or commiſſion, exceſs, defect, or deviation from this perfect rule is *ſin*, and every ſin deſerves wrath, and needs forgiveneſs [r]."

And, having obſerved that "the ten commandments are divinely commented upon, in all the preceptive part of ſcripture;" that "the ſubſtance of them is ſummed up in the two great commands," juſt ſpecified; and that "we are authorized by our Lord's example, to interpret every

(p) Eſſays, p. 41. (q) Ibid. p. 192. (r) Ibid. p. 42.

one of them in the ſtricteſt, moſt ſpiritual, and moſt extenſive ſenſe, of which it is capable [s]," Mr. S. proceeds ſeparately and diſtinctly thus to interpret them. "When," he ſays again, "we flee for refuge to Chriſt by faith, we are delivered from the curſe of the law, and from the legal covenant; but we remain ſubjects of God's moral government and are bound to obedience by new and moſt endearing obligations. 'God forbid, that we ſhould ſin, becauſe we are not under the law, but under grace:' yet there is *no other rule of duty and ſin*, but the *moral law as above defined*, and 'where no law is, there is no tranſgreſſion [t].'" He then ſhows, how ſtrictly Chriſt enjoined obedience to his commandments, to the leaſt of them, expounded in the moſt ſtrict and ſpiritual manner, upon his diſciples; how continually his Apoſtles refer to the law as the Rule of the believer's conduct; and, in the manner and very language of St. Paul, how that we are ſo far from making '*void the law* through faith,' that '*we eſtabliſh the law* [v].'"

The ſame is the unequivocal doctrine of the "Scripture Characters" on the ſubject. "The moral law," ſays Mr. Robinſon, "is the everlaſting rule of righteouſneſs, the grand obligations of which depend not on any peculiar circumſtances of ſituation, but exiſt the ſame in all ages and places. For God muſt ever require his rational creatures to love him with all their hearts, and one another as themſelves. This law he (Chriſt) 'magnified and made honourable;' for by his own obedience and expiatory ſufferings, he ſhowed the extent and equity of its demands; by his ſpiritual expoſition he vindicated it from the falſe interpretations put upon it; and by his holy precepts he enjoined the obſervance of it upon all his people:" ſo that "believers, though releaſed from its penal ſanctions, are ſtill *indiſpenſably bound to regulate their tempers and conduct, agree-*

(s) Ibid. (t) Page 196. (v) Ibid.

ably to its directions [w]." "Wilfully, therefore," adds Mr. R. a little after, "to tranſgreſs the leaſt of theſe precepts, and encourage others to do the ſame, as if they might be diſpenſed with, would render us unfit for a place in his kingdom: and to be diſtinguiſhed in that ſociety, *we muſt yield an univerſal ſubmiſſion to them*, . . . and enforce the ſame conduct upon others." "Jeſus," ſays this Author again, "has inſtructed us," that this divine law "enjoins *perfect holineſs*, in the diſpoſitions of the mind, as well as the practice of the life [x]." On this principle, accordingly, like the Writer laſt quoted, Mr. R. proceeds to a particular expoſition of its precepts, and to apply them to his Chriſtian readers.

Such, and ſo exactly coincident with that of our church, is the *Rule of Morality* taught by theſe two well-known Goſpel-Miniſters. And yet it may be affirmed without the ſmalleſt fear of contradiction, that there is not a ſingle individual amongſt the whole body of teachers under our vindication, who would not cordially ſubſcribe to their ſentiments on the ſubject. This is the ſtandard of morals in thoſe marked objects of Dr. Croft's contempt [y], the "New and Old Churches at Halifax, the New Church at Hull, and the Works of Joſeph Milner [z]." Let him, if he is able, ſhow the contrary.

So notorious indeed are this claſs of Divines for this doctrine, that Mr. Wilberforce, Dr. Hawker, Mr. Venn, and, to uſe his own phraſe, "many writers of the ſame ſtamp," are *cenſured* by Mr. Ludlam on account of it. It is for maintaining that the moral law of God ſtill requires "perfect obedience;" and "that Chriſtianity hath not moderated the requiſitions of God's law, nor mitigated the rigour of its demands," that this Author charges them with great

(w) Vol. i. N. T. p. 142. (x) Ibid. p. 143, 144. (y) See his Thoughts, &c. (z) See for example, The Introduction to his Hiſtory of the Church; The Hiſt. Vol. i. p. 576—584; Vol. ii. p. 448—459, 467—510; and Eſſays on Several Subjects, p. 10—12.

want of penetration, and with oppoſition to St. John and St. Paul[a].

3. But is this the ſtandard of morality our *Opponents* preſcribe? No: "A *ſincere*, not an *unbroken*, obedience," Mr. Ludlam ſays, "is required in the goſpel[b]." "To make ſenſe" of Romans vi. 14; 'We are not under the law, but under grace;' he ſays, we muſt underſtand it to mean, that we Chriſtians are "not under the Jewiſh law of *ſtrict conformity to every command of God*, which is the curſe quoted by the Apoſtle, Gal. iii. 10; but under that *more gracious law*," mentioned Jeremiah xxxi. 31—33; "and ſubject to a more *lenient* rule[c]." Again, "Unleſs," adds Mr. L. "we chooſe to believe Dr. Hawker and Mr. Venn in preference to St. John and St. Paul, we muſt affirm that perfect obedience is not the condition of the New Covenant: ſo far from it, that the great deſign of the covenant of grace is to remove the difficulty, and *ſoften the rigour* of the law of works. For the new covenant admits of a *defective* obedience[d]." And this ſubſtitution of ſincerity for perfection is a common doctrine with theſe Divines[e].

A few obſervations then on theſe opinions naturally occur. And firſt, Mr. Ludlam cannot underſtand Dr. Hawker, Mr. Venn, &c. to hold that perfect obedience to the moral law is the *condition of our acceptance with God*, under the goſpel diſpenſation. He muſt know, if he is at all qualified to ſpeak of their opinions, that theſe Divines teach with our church, that the means by which we obtain juſtification are neither perfect, nor imperfect works; but, "that we are juſtified by faith only." What they maintain is, that the law of God under which the Chriſtian is, not leſs than that to which the Jew was ſubject, is perfectly holy, and juſt, and

(a) See his Six Eſſays, p. 23—27. (b) Ibid. p. 24. (c) Ibid. p. 23. (d) Ibid. p. 25. (e) See above, p. 216; Mr. Polwhele's Letter, p. 42; Dr. S. Carr's Sermons, p. 114; &c.

good; and that it is as much the duty of the one, as it was that of the other, *ſtrictly to conform to it;* and that every deviation from it, in heart or practice, is ſin. And in exact proportion as any man maintains the contrary, he is an Antinomian. But as it is known theſe Divines do not teach that perfect obedience is required in any other ſenſe, this muſt be what is objected againſt them.

To ſay indeed that the Chriſtian covenant, conſidered in all its parts, as conſiſting of both the law and goſpel, does not make ſinleſs obedience eſſential to the ſalvation of individuals, and exclude all room for repentance, and hope of mercy, from the ſinner, is to ſay juſt nothing at all; for under *no* diſpenſation has this been the caſe ſince the fall of Adam, and the promiſe of a Redeemer. So at leaſt teaches the Church of England. "For both in the Old and New Teſtament," ſhe ſays, "everlaſting life is offered to mankind by Chriſt [f]."

But this ſtatement of Mr. L. and his Brethren involves an inconſiſtency upon the very face of it. Either we are under the law which requires, that is, which preſcribes as our duty, "ſtrict conformity to every command of God," or we are not: If we *are*, this is our poſition: If, as Mr. L. aſſerts, we are *not*, our want of ſuch conformity is neither ſin nor imperfection: For "ſin," the Apoſtle ſays, "is the tranſgreſſion of the law [g];" ſurely of that law which the ſinner is under; and imperfection muſt be a coming ſhort of this rule. And, to talk of a law that requires only "a defective," or "a ſincere, not an unbroken obedience" to itſelf, is to talk ſheer nonſenſe. It is, in effect, to ſay, there is a law which "does *not* require *all* that it *does* require." "No law," Mr. L. is conſtrained to grant, "can *permit* a violation of, i. e. a deviation from its commands [h]." And yet, "the new covenant," he ſays, "*admits* of a *defective* obedience [i]!"

(f) Art. 7. (g) 1 John iii. 4. (h) Six Eſſays, p. 26.
(i) Ibid. p. 25.

He seems to own however, that there are no "*expreſs allowances* of imperfect conduct" to be found in it[k]. Where then, it may be aſked, did this Divine learn his "new" and "more lenient rule" of morals[l]? Where did he learn that the preceptive part of this covenant makes any ſuch allowances? Not ſurely from the expoſition given of it by its divine Author, where he declares that he "came not to deſtroy the law but to fulfil; and "that one jot or one tittle ſhall in nowiſe paſs from it, till all be fulfilled;" and diſcovers ſuch ſeverity againſt the Scribes and Phariſees for lowering its demands[m]: Not ſurely from St. Paul, who ſo highly extols its holineſs, its juſtice, its goodneſs, its ſpirituality; who ſays ſo much of its efficacy and excellence in developing the heart and bringing men to Chriſt, and that it is eſtabliſhed by faith; who declares how in his renewed mind and judgment, he approved of it, and delighted in it[n].

But can this information that the divine law admits of a defective obedience be collected from the interpretation put upon it by any other of the ſacred writers? Not ſurely from St. John, for he ſays, "Whoſoever committeth ſin, tranſgreſſeth alſo the law;" and that Chriſt "was manifeſted to take away our ſins[o]:" Not ſurely from St. James, for he ſays, "Whoſoever ſhall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all[p]:" And leaſt of all, ſurely, from the paſſage Mr. L. refers to in Jeremiah, where ſuch a gracious proviſion is made for its fulfilment; where God promiſes the houſe of Iſrael, to "put his law in their inward parts, and to write it in their hearts[q]."

Does not the law we are under forbid all ſin? Does it not command us to love God with all our hearts, our neighbour as ourſelves, and to act accordingly? And is not this requiring perfect obedience?

(k) Ibid. p. 26. (l) Ibid. p. 24. (m) Mat. v. 17, 18. (n) Rom. vii. (o) iii. 4, 5. (p) ii. 10. (q) Jer. xxxi. 31—33.

But, "the Eſtabliſher of ſuch a law may," it is maintained, "ſoften its rigour, and remit its penalties [r]," at his pleaſure. To ſay nothing of what God Almighty *may* do, that is, what he *can* do, if he poſſeſſed the ſame infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs when he firſt eſtabliſhed this law, that he now does; if it is founded in the nature of things; and moſt of all, if he has ſo ſolemnly affirmed the contrary, what ground is there to believe that he *has* thus relaxed it?

Nor does it, as Mr. L. affirms, by any means "amount to the ſame thing," that "the new covenant provides a remedy for ſin [s]." In the former caſe, an imperfect obedience fully anſwers the demands of the law, and thoſe who perform ſuch obedience may ſit down contented: They need no forgiveneſs; they are as holy as they are required to be. In the latter caſe, we ſee continual cauſe for humiliation, application to the Saviour, gratitude towards him; and, whatever our preſent ſtate of moral attainments may be, for renewed efforts after ſtill nearer approaches to our ſtandard.

Neither is it ſufficient to annex the epithet "ſincere" to this defective obedience. Sincerity, in ſome degree, is eſſential to the loweſt acceptable obedience. And a ſincere, that is, a real honeſt deſire to know the Will of God in order to do it, and a due uſe of the means appointed for this end, is a very valuable attainment. Hence, no doubt, "we meet with ſuch frequent and honourable mention of this virtue in Scripture Characters [t]." But however promiſing the ſtate of thoſe who poſſeſs it may be, it is certainly no proof either of the truth of their principles, or the rectitude of their conduct. It is beyond all queſtion that perſons have equally conceived themſelves under the influence of ſincerity with the moſt oppoſite doctrines, and the moſt miſchievous morals.

The Greeks, mentioned by Biſhop Watſon [v] from Hero-

(r) Six Eſſays, p. 26. (s) Ibid. p. 25. (t) Ibid. p. 24. N. (v) Sermons and Ch. 1795, p. 57.

dotus, who burned the bodies of their deceaſed parents, and the Indians who ate them, were equally ſhocked with the conduct of each other, and equally perſuaded of the propriety of their own. Mr. Locke's Eſſay on the Human Underſtanding, and indeed Hiſtory and Obſervation in general, ſupply us with ſimilar inſtances innumerable. But we need only have recourſe to the ſacred records. Paul was ſincere when he perſecuted the Saviour whom he afterwards ſo zealouſly preached. He could teſtify before the council, when a Chriſtian, concerning his conduct when a Phariſee, that he "was zealous toward God;" that he had "lived in all good conſcience before God until that day;" and that he "verily thought with himſelf that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jeſus of Nazareth [w]." And, even many of thoſe ſubjects of our Lord's ſevere reprehenſion, the ancient Phariſees, whoſe guilt in no ſmall degree conſiſted in relaxing the ſtandard of the Divine Law, were, according to the ordinary ſenſe of the word, ſincere. They "truſted in themſelves that they were righteous [x]." Our Lord alſo forewarned his diſciples of a ſeaſon, when "whoſoever killed them would think that he did God ſervice [y]."

And in ſhort, the term Sincerity, when uſed for the purpoſe here in queſtion, means juſt any thing or nothing. Mr. Ludlam would doubtleſs profeſs himſelf ſincere in his repeated ſubſcription to the laws, or doctrinal ſtandards, of our church, and in his engagements to teach according to their ſtrict and literal meaning, and not to differ in the leaſt from them [a]. And yet, if words have any meaning, he not only teaches doctrines very different from thoſe here contained, but affirms of ſeveral of the moſt expreſs of them, that they are unintelligible, abſurd, and even impoſſible [b]! He may

(w) See Acts xxii. 3; xxiii. 1; xxvi. 9. (x) St. Luke xviii. 9. (y) St. John xvi. 2.

(a) See above, p. 46, &c. (b) See above, p. 182; and below, on Candour.

call it "sincerity of persuasion," or "sincerity of inquiry," or "sincerity of conviction [c]," or what he chuses, we are to suppose that it is something which permits him, with a good conscience, to obey the law by which he is most solemnly bound, by violating it from year to year, in whatever way he pleases.——Others with similar pretensions to this virtue have, in some degree, acted similarly [d]. Such an excellent substitute for a perfect standard in morals is Sincerity!

Neither is it, as Mr. L. insinuates, "inconsistent to say," in the sense we say it, "that perfect obedience" is required under the New Covenant, when the best of Christians are conscious of "many remaining infirmities [e]." It is surely a very lax morality to argue from what men really do, that it is all they ought to do. It is only through the excellency and perfection of the law, which, like St. Paul, in their renewed minds they assent unto, and approve, that such Christians discover these defects. It is also hence, that, after this eminent pattern, they see the necessity, during their whole pilgrimage here, of "forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before," and "pressing toward the mark [f]."

All this however is supererogation. Our issue turns not upon the justness of these observations. The main contest here is, who teaches the strictest morality? And, as far as the *Rule* of it is concerned, *we* certainly, who contend for a *perfect one*, have the *advantage* over those who professedly prescribe one that is *imperfect*.

Another deviation from this standard of morals among these Divines, is, their conduct respecting the *conversion* and *renovation of the heart*. This, it has appeared, they are so far from inculcating as *generally essential* in Christianity,

(c) See Six Essays, p. 25. (d) See Chapter 1; and below on Candour. (e) Six Essays, p. 27. (f) Phil. iii. 13, 14.

that they more commonly treat it with ridicule and contempt [g].

It is further obſervable, that many of theſe moraliſts profeſſedly account little of the *immediate duties* of the *firſt table* of the law. Little further attention is required to this claſs of precepts than is deemed neceſſary to ſecure obedience to the ſecond table. One way in which they diſcover this ſentiment is, by their diſpoſition to repreſent all zealous regard to the immediate worſhip and ſervice of our Maker, as a characteriſtic of Enthuſiaſm.

"In the duties we owe to God," Mr. Clapham's favourite author ſays, "Enthuſiaſts of every kind ſeem to be of opinion, that we cannot be guilty of any exceſs [h]." But "the laying ſo great ſtreſs on ſuch ſervices," he adds, "muſt foſter a ſpirit moſt inconſiſtent with our idea of the greateſt and beſt of Beings. It is repreſenting him as a Tyrant, and a Tyrant to be pleaſed only by continual fawning and flattering: a Tyrant impoſing a yoke of cruel ſervitude upon his creatures [i]. Beſides," it is alſo taught, "ſo great a portion of time, devoted to this ſervice, encroaches upon that time, that we are to dedicate to induſtry and to ſociety;" . . . and is imitating "the worſt part of Popery [k]."

In ſuch a light does the doctrine of their catechiſm appear to theſe Gentlemen! No Enthuſiaſts can lay greater ſtreſs upon our duty towards God than this does; when it ſays, it "is to believe in him, to fear him, and to love him, with *all* the heart, with *all*, &c." No Enthuſiaſts can well expound this duty to imply more than is made of it in our homilies [l]! And how much more time do perſons conſume, without cenſure, in places of public Amuſement

---

(g) See above, p. 112—127; and p. 164—171. (h) Review of the Policy, &c. p. 29. (i) Ibid. p. 30. (k) Ibid. (l) See above, p. 222.

and Diſſipation than is *ever* conſumed in the public worſhip of God [z]?

Mr. Polwhele's language favours of the ſame ſpirit. Meeting the opinion of thoſe who think that ſome additional ſeaſons of religious worſhip in the eſtabliſhment, would diminiſh the number of ſectaries, he ſays, "Any additional attendance on the church would give a puritanical aſpect to the ſabbath, and throw a Phariſaical gloom over the moſt cheerful religion in the world [y]." "Surely," he ſays again, "it ought never to be forgotten, that the *relative duties* are, of all, the *moſt indiſpenſable*; and, that the love of God is a mere chimera, unleſs it manifeſt itſelf in the love of man [x]." The former part of this paſſage determines, in contradiction to our Lord, that the duties of the ſecond table are more indiſpenſable than thoſe of the firſt. The latter part of the ſentence is true in its full extent: But then, the converſe is equally true; the love of man, or rather all pretenſion to it, is a mere chimera, in the view of the Goſpel, where the love of God is wanting [w].

But, that the immediate worſhip of God is only required to the *extent* which has been mentioned, we are taught expreſsly. "The eſſence of religion," it is ſtated, "conſiſts in a good life."..... "Preaching and praying, and all other external ſervices," it is therefore argued, "are neceſſary ſo far as they ſupport this life;" but, that "no further ſtreſs is to be laid upon them [m]." "Too much," Biſhop Shipley laments, "is made of faith and devotion [n]." "The crime of Atheiſm itſelf;" Dr. Balguy ſays, "conſiſts in

(z) "The Love of God," the Pious Biſhop Butler obſerves, "will every where, by the generality of the world,... be called Enthuſiaſm." Preface to 15 Sermons at Rolls Chapel, p. 33.

(y) Letter, p. 70, Note. (x) Ibid, p. 71, Note. (w) See 1 Cor. xiii; 1 John, Chap. v. and Chap. vi. (m) Review of the Policy, &c. p. 28. (n) Sermon at Chriſt Church, London, 1777, Works, p. 346.

this, that it ſubverts morality [o];" that is, as explained by themſelves, the proper conduct of man towards man. "The importance of faith," he ſays, "ariſes from its influence on our actions; and the importance of actions from their influence on the general happineſs [p]." "It is nothing to him (God) whether the wickedneſs and folly of poor mortals break out in one ſhape or another. The higheſt offence they can poſſibly commit againſt him, is to hurt themſelves." "For *our ſakes only* was the command given, 'Thou ſhalt have none other Gods but me [q].'" "The happineſs of men, is the *end*, and the *meaſure*, even of our *duty to God* [r]."

Of what importance to the Supreme Being our ſervices may be, it is not our buſineſs to determine. It is enough that he *commands* our worſhip; and that, both in the ſummary of his law and our form of daily Prayer, he teaches us to regard his honour as our leading object. If there be perſons who, under a pretence of ſerving God, really neglect their duty to man, they are by no means vindicated by us. Whoſe ſyſtem is the ſtricteſt, in reſpect to the relative duties, ſhall appear preſently. Here we muſt remark, that this language of our opponents certainly repreſents "the *firſt and great commandment*," as a mere ſubſidiary to the *ſecond*. Nay, it follows from hence, that when men are perſuaded that they diſcharge their duty towards their neighbour, they may, with a good conſcience, neglect what immediately relates to God altogether; the former being the great end and object of the latter. And how different is this notion from that of our church on the ſubject. She teaches us, to perform our duty towards man, "for God's ſake;" the doctrine here is, that we muſt ſerve God only for man's ſake; becauſe, in ſome degree, it is requiſite to ſecure the good order of ſociety. Who will wonder that

(o) Ch. vi. p. 283. (p) Ibid. (q) Ibid. p. 286, 287. (r) Ibid. p. 222.

our Churches are deſerted while theſe are the notions propagated by Divines [z]?

But let us take the matter on their own grounds: Let us try this boaſted ſtrictneſs of their morality, in regard to the duties of the *ſecond table*.——Among theſe, are the duties of "temperance, ſoberneſs, and chaſtity," and whatever reſpects the proper government of the appetites and paſſions; which properly conſtitute our duty towards ourſelves. Here then we are to expect ſtrictneſs. A very few quotations however will ſhow that the contrary is the fact. "However indulgent," Dr. Carr ſays, "the Saviour of the world may be to the accidental failures of infirmities or paſſion, he has no where promiſed forgiveneſs to thoſe who are a prey to every temptation. If therefore we have fallen into adultery, theft, murder, &c. our repentance muſt

(z) How different too is all this from the notions of the profound and pious Biſhop Butler on the ſubject. "Devotion or religious Worſhip," this Prelate obſerves, "is retirement from the world he (God) has made, to him alone: It is to withdraw from the avocations of ſenſe, to employ our attention wholly upon him as upon an object actually preſent, to yield ourſelves up to the influence of the Divine Preſence, and to give full ſcope to the affections of gratitude, love, reverence, truſt, and dependence; of which infinite power, wiſdom, and goodneſs, is the natural and only adequate object. We may apply to the whole of devotion thoſe words of the ſon of Sirach: 'When you glorify the Lord, exalt him as much as you can; for even yet will he far exceed: and when you exalt him, put forth all your ſtrength, and be not weary; for you can never go far enough.' Our moſt raiſed affections of every kind cannot but fall ſhort and be diſproportionate, when an infinite Being is the object of them. This is the higheſt exerciſe and employment of mind, that a creature is capable of. As this *Divine Service and Worſhip is itſelf abſolutely due to God*, ſo alſo is it neceſſary in order to a further end, to keep alive upon our minds a ſenſe of his authority, a ſenſe that in our ordinary behaviour amongſt men, we act under him as our Governor and Judge." See his admirable Sermon on the Love of God, p. 285, and paſſim. So alſo in

cloſely follow[s]." "Chriſt," he ſays again, "does not require perfect obedience; but, that we ſeriouſly liſten to his voice and Miniſters;" that we do "not *yield to every temptation, and fall a prey to every luſt;*" that we do "not perſevere in *habits* of known and wilful guilt, but ſincerely endeavour, &c. after his example, as far as our weak nature will admit. This is *all he requires* [t]."

"Swearing and drunkenneſs," and ſuch other "glaring vices, that make the moſt noiſe in the world," they ſay, "are the ſigns of a thoughtleſs mind, rather than of a depraved

---

his excellent Charge now annexed to the "Analogy" by Biſhop Halifax, ſpeaking of *Externals* in religion, he obſerves, "Theſe things are neglected to a degree, which is, and cannot but be attended with a decay of all that is good." And, having obſerved that "the conſcientious attendance upon Divine Service ought often to be inculcated upon the people, as a plain precept of the Goſpel, as the means of grace, and what has peculiar promiſes annexed to it;" and that "external acts of piety and devotion, and the frequent returns of them are moreover neceſſary to keep up a ſenſe of religion, which the affairs of the world will otherwiſe wear out of men's hearts;" he proceeds, "For this reaſon, beſides others, the Service of the Church ought to be celebrated as often as you can have a congregation to attend it.... But ſince the body of the people, eſpecially in country places, cannot be brought to attend it oftener than one day in a week; and ſince *this is in no ſort enough* to keep up in them a due ſenſe of religion, it were greatly to be wiſhed they could be perſuaded to any thing which might, in ſome meaſure, ſupply the want of more frequent public devotions, or ſerve the like purpoſes." Let Divines then learn from Biſhop Butler, "that regard to *one* duty will in no ſort atone for the neglect of any other." See p. 464—466. Let them learn alſo from the pious Mr. Boyle, "not to daſh the two Tables of the Law one againſt another." Let them obſerve the ſtrain in which this great man ſpeaks of devotion and our duty towards our Maker. See his Theol. Works, Vol. ii. Chap. "Containing motives and incentives to the Love of God."—— But what avails the authority of a Butler and a Boyle againſt a ſcrap of poetry and a ſneer?

(s) Sermon 50, p. 112. (t) Ibid. p. 114.

heart [v]!"——The vices of our Univerſities have, doubtleſs, been exaggerated. In reſpect to Cambridge at leaſt, it is certainly indulging more than poetic licence, to affirm that ſtudy languiſhes, and emulation ſleeps [w]. A far greater proportion of her members, it may be ſafely affirmed, are induſtrious, and, in the ordinary ſenſe of the words, ſober, and moral, than is often imagined. But there is, it muſt alſo be admitted, both here and in the ſiſter Seminary, a claſs, who are, as the poet juſtly deſcribes them, "brothellers impure, ſpendthrifts," and victims of the moſt complicated intemperance [x]. Yet, when characters of this deſcription are objected againſt as unfit to be admitted into "the Holy Order of Prieſts," Dr. Croft ſoftly ſtyles theſe enormities "the irregularities of young men;" which, he ſays, "are with ingenuous minds, their own remedy [y]."

And will they pretend to ſtrict notions of the moral precepts of Chriſtianity, who can reconcile them with the preſent morality of the *Stage?* There is ſurely ſomething very different in the ſpirit and deportment inculcated in the one, and exhibited on the other. Rarely does the complete entertainment of an evening terminate without being polluted with open profanation of God's name, irreverent alluſions to things ſacred, or geſtures and innuendos which in ordinary life would ſhock common modeſty [z]. And is this conſiſtent with "loving God with all our heart, and in all things ſeeking his glory?" Is this acting according to the ſpirit of the ſeventh commandment; to ſeek our entertainment, or as ſome will have it, our moral improvement, amidſt profanation and obſcenity?

But the worſt is, that what is eſteemed good in theſe amuſements, is good for nothing. The morality they

---

(v) Review of Policy, &c. p. 29. (w) See Cowper's Taſk, p. 83. (x) See ibid. p. 84. (y) Thoughts, &c. p. 27. (z) See, e. g. Every one has his Fault; The Wedding Day; The Stranger; The Beggar's Opera; Pizarro, &c.

uſually inculcate, is equally at variance with the more ſublime precepts of ſcripture, and the plain duties of common life. It is, for the moſt part, founded in pride, in ambition, in exceſſive love of fame, in the exaltation of one virtue at the expence of another, in fiction, in extravagance, or in abſurdity. The object of the conductors of thoſe ſcenes is to attract and gratify the multitude, in order to gain. But chaſte and correct repreſentations of human life and manners will not effect this end. Their entertainments therefore are ſtudiouſly accommodated to the reigning taſtes and appetites of their gueſts. And hence, the very zeſt and ſoul of them conſiſts in what is wrong; in exciting and cheriſhing thoſe tempers and paſſions, which it is the object of Chriſtianity to reſtrain and ſubdue; and their general tendency can only be to diſſipate and corrupt.

The foreign and poiſonous traſh which is now the rage, is indeed infidelity and licentiouſneſs without a maſk [a]. And for the reſt, even Voltaire, a Deiſt, teſtifies of our "Engliſh Comedy," that "the incidents and language of it, are thoſe of ribaldry and debauchery [b]." Archbiſhop Tillotſon denominates the Playhouſe, "The Devil's Chapel; The School and Nurſery of lewdneſs and vice [c]." Preciſely ſimilar were the ſentiments of the Fathers Cyprian and Chryſoſtom [y]. The Antijacobin Reviewers thus pourtray the preſent ſtate of the Theatres in the Metropolis: "The front boxes are almoſt excluſively devoted to women of the Town; the lobbies ſwarm with them; they occupy every part of the houſe, with the ſolitary exception of the ſide boxes and the firſt circle; the rooms intended for the purpoſes of refreſhment are like the ſhow-rooms of a bagnio; and it is next to impoſſible for a virtuous woman to walk from her box to her carriage without having her eyes of-

(a) Kotzebue's. &c. (b) Works. (c) Works, Vol. i. Sermon 53. (y) See Milner's Hiſtory of the Church, Vol. i. p. 464; Vol. ii. p. 321.

fended, and her ears ſhocked, by the moſt indecent geſtures, and the moſt obſcene language. And in this moſt profligate exhibition, the young men are as bad as, if not worſe than, the women. At a ſummer Theatre, we have ſeen the performance abſolutely ſtopped by the noiſe of theſe male and female proſtitutes, and the front boxes rendered the ſcene of actions fit only for a brothel [z]."

How therefore men who have profeſſed themſelves perſuaded they were "inwardly moved by the Holy Ghoſt to take upon them the office of Miniſters for the promoting of God's glory and the edifying of his people;" and who have ſolemnly engaged that, "laying aſide the ſtudy of the world and the fleſh," they will labour, "as much as lieth in them" to faſhion both themſelves and others, according to the doctrine and example of their maſter [d]; how the Ambaſſadors of Chriſt can be avowed advocates for ſuch modes of diverſion, muſt ſeem extraordinary: How they can reconcile theſe practices with his example, and with the plain precepts of his word which ſo expreſsly condemn all unneceſſary intercourſe with the wicked, all "corrupt communication," levity, "filthineſs, fooliſh talking, and jeſting [e]," it is ſurely difficult to conceive.——The wonder however is increaſed, if, when they act thus, they ſolemnly profeſs, that it is their hope and wiſh to do "ſervice to religion," and "to continue and as far as poſſible improve the bleſſings of a regular miniſtry in the Church of England [f];" and if, at the ſame time, the grand article in religion upon which they value themſelves, and on account of which they deſpiſe others, is their *pure morality!*

Yet, under all theſe circumſtances, in oppoſition to ſuch Chriſtian Miniſters as diſapprove of theatrical entertain-

(z) June, 1800, p. 204, 5.
(c) See, e. g. Epheſ v. 1—21; 2 Cor. vi 14—18; Rom. xii. 2; Luke vi. 20—26; &c. &c.
(d) See the Ordination Service.
(f) See D. Croft's Thoughts, &c. Preface, and p. 50.

ments in the preſent ſtate, Dr. Croft ſays, "Perhaps the Stage was never leſs exceptionable than at preſent. If it be not a *ſchool of virtue*, it may be a ſource of *innocent* amuſement [g]." The conductors of the Britiſh Critic are conſtrained to acknowledge, contrary to Dr. Croft, that "the *ſhameful indecency at preſent* viſible in our theatres, makes it indeed difficult to defend them;" but at the ſame time, they offer ſeveral apologies on behalf of them; and affirm of an eminent modern Writer, that "his ideas concerning the Stage are carried to a miſtaken degree of ſtrictneſs [h]." Mr. Fellowes is zealous in their defence. In his judgment, the ſeeming "to conſider the Theatres as inauſpicious to piety," is "raking from its aſhes the ſpirit of Calvin, ſcowling with the moroſeneſs of fanaticiſm.... Notwithſtanding all the corruptions of the Theatre," he believes "a great balance will remain in favour of their general tendency to promote the Intereſts of virtue..... On the ſame ground," Mr. F. inſinuates, that Mr. Wilberforce would not frequent the Playhouſe, "he might abſtain from the ſenate or the ſanctuary." But "the Divine Author of Chriſtianity," Mr. W. is reminded, "eat with publicans and ſinners." And "does he not know," it is added, "that virtue is proved by reſiſting temptation; and that he diſcovers the brighteſt integrity, who is chaſte amid ſeduction, and incorrupt amid corruption [i]?"——When then this Divine ſays his Lord's Prayer, he requeſts, that he may not be led into *temptation:* here he recommends deliberately going into it, for the proof and ſublimation of our virtue!

The Antijacobin Reviewers favour us with a quotation of the paſſage from Mr. F. containing theſe and ſimilar remarks; and ſay, "The admirers of the Theatre will, we doubt not, acknowledge the *ſtrength and truth* of it [k]."——

(g) Ibid. p. 16. This pamphlet was publiſhed in 1795.

(h) See Brit. Crit. for Sep. 1797, p. 302. (i) See his "Picture of Chriſtian Philoſophy," Oxon. 1799. (k) For Dec. 1799, p. 389.

This may not however prove doctrine for which the miniſters of Chriſt will give an account with joy. It may not be found that theſe entertainments have been innocent and uſeful at that ſolemn period, when our offices, our time, our talents, "and every idle word which we have ſpoken," muſt be accounted for [l].

Similar objections apply to other of the practices which theſe moraliſts claſs among "innocent amuſements;" and for which, with almoſt one voice [m], they are ſtrenuous advocates.——Either the diverſions are, in ſome degree, evil in themſelves, or in their tendency; or they are ſo conſtantly abuſed, and under ſuch circumſtances, that it is nearly impoſſible to partake of them, without partaking alſo of this abuſe: for any of which reaſons they may ſurely be avoided without fanaticiſm.

It is not indeed without ſome diſcrimination and reſerve that diverſions are vindicated and recommended. "Of Horſe-Races," Dr. Croft ſays, "without doubt, the evil by far outweighs the good [n]." There *are bounds* too, he appears to think, beyond which the Clergy ought not to proceed in theſe engagements. In anſwer to the aſſertions of Dr. Knox and Dr. Wendeborn, "that our public places of amuſement abound with idle and diſſolute Clergymen," Dr. C. ſays, "This is not the caſe in Bath," and that "Bath is as fair an inſtance as can be produced;" and that "the few Clerical Gameſters who are ſeen there, are ſpoken of with marked contempt, and juſt abhorrence [o]."

The zeal with which public amuſements are yet proſecuted, and that they are ſtill "as profane, as looſe, as exceptionable, in kind and in degree," as they ever were, an eminent Prelate pathetically laments, in the firſt Aſſembly in the nation. This he conſiders as a deciſive mark that God's Judgments which are abroad have not yet brought us

(l) See Mat. xii. 36. (m) See Dr. Croft's Thoughts, p. 16; Mr. Clapham's Sermon, p. 20, 21; Scripture Doctrine of Grace, p. 192; &c. (n) Thoughts, p. 16. (o) Ibid. p. 6, 7.

to repentance[s]. And is it the buſineſs of the miniſters of Jeſus to countenance thoſe practices which are proofs of impenitence?

There are, no doubt, innocent amuſements. And ſome Chriſtians, it may be, have been too ſcrupulous reſpecting them. This however is certainly the ſafer ſide, and that to which genuine love to God will incline.——Beſides, all things do not become all men. The conduct that, under many circumſtances, might properly be connived at, may be highly improper to be ſanctioned and encouraged by thoſe who are ſet apart to be as the Salt of the Earth[t].

At any rate, in proportion as latitude is pleaded for in theſe, at leaſt doubtful, matters, the claim to ſuperior *ſtrictneſs* in morals muſt be relinquiſhed, which is all we have here to eſtabliſh.

But it is not, it will perhaps be ſaid, that part of the *Second Table* which reſpects a man's ſelf, but that which reſpects his neighbour, the *ſocial* and *relative* duties, on which the ſtreſs ſhould be laid in morals.——Let us then indulge our opponents yet further, and take a ſpecimen of their *ſtrictneſs* on this branch of the ſubject.

A leading duty of this claſs, in the church's judgment, is, that of *Loyalty to the King*, and *Subjection to civil Government*. And reſpecting the nature of this duty, her opinion is, that 'the powers that be, are ordained of God;' and that *as God's miniſters* they are *in all caſes to be obeyed*, except when "they command us to do any thing contrary to God's commandments:" and that in this inſtance, our duty is not to attempt to undermine their authority, or to compel them to change their ſyſtem; but rather, to conſider their indiſcretion as the juſt judgment of God for the ſins of our nation, and as a call to repentance; to exerciſe in a legal and peaceable manner, according to our ſtation in ſociety, that liberty of

(s) See the Biſhop of Durham's Sermon before the Houſe of Lords.
(t) See Mat. v. 13.

judgment and conduct with which the constitution we live under invests us; and, as far as this fails of success, "patiently to suffer all wrongs and injuries" for the truth's sake, "referring the judgment of our cause only to God."

This doctrine she illustrates so clearly, and inculcates so forcibly, as to exclude all doubt respecting her opinion, either in regard to its nature or importance [v]. Two short quotations shall however warrant our assertion. Speaking of the "higher powers" then, she says, "All subjects are bound to obey them *as God's ministers*, yea, although they be *evil*, not only for fear, but also for conscience sake. And here let us all mark diligently, that it is not lawful for inferiors and subjects, *in any case*, to resist and stand against the Superior Powers: for St. Paul's words be plain, that whosoever withstandeth, shall get to themselves damnation: for whosoever withstandeth, withstandeth the ordinance of God [w]." Again, "What," she says, "shall subjects do then? Shall they obey valiant, stout, wise, and good princes, and contemn, disobey, and rebel against children being their princes, or against undiscreet and evil governors? God forbid [x]." This system she proceeds at large to show, is both absurd in itself, and contrary to the most express precept, and the general example, of scripture [y].

But all this is certainly very different from what Dr. Paley and his adherents teach. His simile of the flock of pigeons, and whole manner of speaking on the subject, certainly suggest very different ideas from those here inculcated, of the duties of loyalty and subordination. The simile is, in short, to this effect; that should we see a flock of an hundred pigeons in a field of corn, ninety and nine of which should toil and labour to heap up and protect for *one* all the choicest and best corn, and reserve for themselves

---

(v) See the Catechism; and the Homilies on Obedience to Rulers, and against Rebellion, passim. (w) Hom. on Obedience to Rulers, p. 65. (x) Hom. on Rebellion, p. 354. ( ) Ibid.

only the chaff and refuſe, and this one perhaps the weakeſt and the worſt, which devours and waſtes it with the greateſt folly and profuſion, we ſhould "ſee nothing more than what is every day practiſed and eſtabliſhed among men [z]."

"The oath of allegiance," Dr. P. ſays, "excludes all deſign, *at the time*, of attempting to depoſe the reigning Prince, for any reaſon whatever [a]."——Does it not then follow, if this is all, that, the day after, or at any other time, whenever the ſubject ſhall have changed his mind, the obligation of the oath ceaſes? "It *permits* reſiſtance to the King," the Dr. adds, "when his ill behaviour, or imbecillity is ſuch as to make reſiſtance beneficial to the community [q]." "The juſtice of every particular caſe of reſiſtance," he ſays again, "is reduced to a computation of the quantity of the danger and grievance on the one ſide, and of the probability and expence of redreſſing it, on the other. But WHO," he proceeds to aſk, "ſhall JUDGE of this? EVERY MAN," he anſwers, "FOR HIMSELF." The deciſion muſt be formed by "the exerciſe of a *man's private judgment*;" or "by the *advice of others*, provided he be free to chooſe his Guide [b]." He further adds, "It may be AS MUCH A DUTY, at one time, to RESIST GOVERNMENT, as it is at another, to obey it; to wit, WHENEVER more advantage will, IN OUR OPINION, accrue to the community from reſiſtance, than miſchief [c]."

Now this, we muſt maintain, is very obſcure and lax morality. It releaſes men from the plain precepts of the Word of God, which enjoin obedience to Governors, becauſe his Providence has made them ſuch, and which are intelligible to the meaneſt capacity, and leaves every man to act according to his own prejudices and fancy, or the influence of ſome deſigning leader; as if the ſcriptures were wholly ſilent

(z) Moral and Political Phil. Chap. on Property, p. 91.
(a) Ibid. p. 170. (q) Ibid. p. 171. (b) Ibid. Ch. on Duty of Submiſſion, p. 424. (c) Ibid. p. 425.

on the ſubject. It places a Thus ſaith St. Paul, and Thus ſaith Tom Paine, preciſely on the ſame footing, as both are to be eſtimated only by their tendency.——Beſides, whether it be confined ſtrictly to politics, or extended to the relative duties in general, there is an abſurdity upon the very face of the principle. It is, as the church juſtly repreſents it [d], in the ordinary courſe of its operation, making "the foot the judge of the head."——"It would be abſurd," Dr. P. ſays, "to commit the deciſion," when the government ſhould be reformed or changed, "to *thoſe* whoſe conduct has provoked the queſtion, and whoſe own intereſt, authority, and fate are immediately concerned in it [e];" i. e. to the Governors.

But how, it may be inquired, in a Government like ours, combining the wiſdom of ages, can the chief agents of it ſo effectually promote their own credit and intereſt, as by uniformly aiming at the happineſs of the people? Is it not however more abſurd, and infinitely more dangerous, to make the *Governed* ſole judges in the caſe? In theſe, as Dr. P. obſerves, "in the moſt popular forms of civil government, the phyſical ſtrength reſides [f]." This therefore once excited to action, reſembles an impetuous and utterly reſiſtleſs torrent. And there is in the very conſtitution of our nature an hatred of ſubmiſſion and obedience. This claſs of men alſo, as forming the majority in every nation, are deſtined, both by the expreſs appointment of Providence and the ordinary courſe of Nature, to earn their bread by the ſweat of their brow. Their ſituation therefore, under the very beſt adminiſtration of government, is neceſſarily that which they will conceive has the leaſt to fear from any political change, and which will as neceſſarily moſt incline them to wiſh for it

Theſe circumſtances alſo exclude them, in a very great

(d) Hom. on Rebellion, p. 354. (e) Moral and Pol. Phil. p. 424. (f) Ibid. p. 406.

degree, from the advantages which learning, leiſure for reflection, and the ſociety of great and wiſe men, beſtow. And how, in the name of common ſenſe, can miners, mechanics, huſbandmen, and the great body of ſubjects, whoſe attention has been almoſt wholly occupied about their reſpective callings, be any competent judges reſpecting the perfection of governments, and the moſt politic conduct of nations? How can perſons ſo ſituated, decide with propriety on queſtions reſpecting War and Peace, Alliances and Commerce, and other intricate ſubjects of Government, on which the wiſeſt and moſt virtuous of men, whoſe whole lives have been ſpent in ſuch inveſtigations, are divided? This is taking the Cobbler beyond his laſt with a witneſs! How amongſt the many directly oppoſite opinions of faction ſhall honeſt men of this deſcription know which to eſpouſe? Yet, on the principle we are oppoſing, this is their *only rule of duty* in the affair; only *as they can ſee the public advantage* ariſing from one meaſure rather than another, are they bound to comply with any of them. Strict morality truly!

And can any perſons really perſuade themſelves that this is the doctrine of Scripture? If there be a point reſpecting morals, upon which the Word of God is ſingularly explicit, ſurely it is in enforcing the very oppoſite doctrine; namely, that the duty it preſcribes to one party, in any of the ordinary relations of ſociety, does not ceaſe becauſe the correſpondent duty is neglected by the other party [g]. And in regard to that which reſpects the "higher Powers," "the King as Supreme, and Governors" as having authority under him, Chriſtians, as the church has largely ſhown, were enjoined to ſubmit to, to honour, and, in all things not contrary to God's expreſs commands, to obey them, "for the Lord's ſake," and "for conſcience ſake," when

(g) See g. e. Ephes. v. 22; vi. 12; vi. 5—7; Coloſs. iii. 18; 1 Peter ii. 18, 19; Rom. xiii.

ſuch monſters as Nero were at the head of affairs[h] And really, they who, with Dr. P., can infer the very oppoſite doctrine from Romans xiii. and 1 Peter ii. are prepared to make the ſcriptures teach juſt any thing or nothing.

The ſimile of the Apoſtle[i], in reſpect to the different Orders and Ranks in the Church, is equally applicable to thoſe of the State. The perfection of the Body conſiſts in each member performing its own proper function; and deformity and confuſion in the want of this. The exhortation in regard to duty in general therefore is, "that we ſtudy to be quiet, and to do our own buſineſs[k]," and leave others to do theirs, or to anſwer for their neglect to their own maſter.——In a word, ſo far is the miſconduct of our neighbour toward us, from diſſolving our obligations of duty towards him, that the morality moſt peculiarly Chriſtian, which only is conſonant either with the precepts or example of Chriſt, is, to love, and to do good to thoſe who hate us; to recompenſe to no man evil for evil; never to be overcome of evil; but to labour by unwearied acts of forgiveneſs and kindneſs to overcome evil with good[l].

Such are the Writer's notions, in conformity with which he has elſewhere ſpoken[m]; and ſuch, in effect, are the common ſentiments of the ſubjects of this apology. See in particular in proof of this aſſertion, Mr. Milner's Hiſtory of the Church[n], and Mr. Walker's Sermons on the fifth commandment[o]; works which this claſs of divines univerſally approve. See alſo Mr. Dikes'[p] Thankſgiving-Sermon,

---

(h) Above, p. 245. (i) 1 Cor. xii.; and Rom. xii. (k) 1 Theſſ. iv. 11.; Rom. xii. 18. (l) Mat. v. 39, &c.; Rom. xii. 14, &c. (m) See a Sermon, entitled "England's Cauſes for Thankfulneſs, preached Nov. 1798, by a Curate in the Country." (n) Eſpecially the Chap. on Eccleſiaſtical Eſtabliſhments, Vol. ii. and Preface to the ſecond Edition of Vol. i. (o) See Lectures on the Church Catechiſm by Samuel Walker, A. B. Ser. 33—40.
(p) "Miniſter of the New Church at Hull;" ſee quotation from Dr. Croft above, p. 13.

1798; Mr. Robinſon's[q] "Serious Exhortation to the inhabitants of Great Britain," previous to the Faſt in 1795; Mr. Scott's "Obſervations on the Signs and Duties of the preſent times[r];" and in ſhort, the general language of our Writers every where. "It is worth obſerving," ſays a warm and conſcientious ſupporter of government, ſpeaking of the teachers who ſteadily and zealouſly inculcate the true doctrines of the Church of England, "that theſe men, as might naturally be expected, are, perhaps, without exception, friendly to our eccleſiaſtical and civil eſtabliſhments, and conſequently, that their inſtructions and influence tend directly, as well as indirectly, to the maintenance of the cauſe of order and good government[s]." "This," it is added, "is not thrown out raſhly, but aſſerted on the writer's own knowledge[t]." And where is the individual who has laboured more zealouſly, and more ſucceſsfully, in this important cauſe, than a celebrated female writer[v] of the ſame ſchool? May it not be doubted whether even the exploits of a Nelſon have contributed more toward the preſervation of our national comforts, than her excellent Tracts have done?

Dr. Paley may ſtill affirm, if he pleaſes, that our ſyſtem "lays the ax at once to the root of all religion[w]," and ſhow, if he can, the ſuperior ſtrictneſs of his own. He will however ſurely not pretend to a greater coincidence with our church on this doctrine. She, he will obſerve, calls upon us to "mark diligently, that it is not lawful for in-

---

(q) Author of "Scripture Characters." (r) This work has been treated with ſeverity; becauſe in arguing with thoſe Chriſtians who will not go *all lengths* with us, Mr. S. intreats them, at leaſt, "to join with us in this ſeaſon of danger, in prayer for our country and for the church of God that is among us, as far as, after ſerious and careful deliberation," they believe they conſcientiouſly can!! See p. 29. (s) See Mr. Wilberforce's Practical View, p. 490. (t) Ibid. Note. (v) Mrs. More. (w) Above, p. 91.

feriors and subjects IN ANY CASE to *resist*, and stand against the superior Powers; he says, "It may be *as much a duty* at one time, to RESIST GOVERNMENT, as it is at another to obey it."

We charge no persons with the Doctor's sentiments, but those who professedly hold them. Some of our opponents, we know, as cordially disapprove of them as we do. We do not even say that it is for his discussion of this "particular moral virtue," that he has Dr. Croft's "warmest gratitude[x]." This observation however seems to force itself upon us, that it is no wonder our Government finds it necessary to strengthen the laws against Republicans, while in the first Seminary in the Nation our Sons are educated in principles like these.

We will next take the Duty of a *Superior* in Office toward an *Inferior;* namely, that of a Minister to his People.——No duty, surely, in the judgment of Divines, can be either more important in itself, or more intimately connected with the cause of morality in general, than this is. To have the charge of the immortal souls of a parish committed unto us! To be the appointed "messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord!" To have voluntarily and solemnly engaged to "teach, admonish, feed, and seek after our flocks, that they may be saved through Christ for ever; and never to cease our labour, our care, and diligence, until we have done all that lieth in us, according to our bounden duty, to bring them to that knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among us, either for error in religion, or for viciousness in life[p]!"——What duty can be more momentous in the estimation of those who really believe they must one day give an account of their stewardships; or, who really regard, either the honour of God, or the happiness of men!

(x) Thoughts, p. 24. (p) See the Ordination Service.

"Every expreſſion," as the learned and pious Biſhop of London obſerves, is applied to our office, "that implies *perſonal attention*, unremitted aſſiduity, vigilance and fidelity[q]." Nor is there in the Ordination vow, as another pious modern Prelate has obſerved, "the moſt diſtant reſervation, for any *vicarious* diſcharge of the duties it impoſes. Voluntarily, after the moſt ſolemn admonitions, the matureſt deliberation, in the ſight and hearing of God and of man, we vowed to watch every neceſſity, and ſeize every occaſion, *within* our Cures, of diſcharging theſe duties[r]."

Perſonal Reſidence is alſo the expreſs condition on which the deſignation to any church is obtained from the Biſhop[s]. "You will undoubtedly recollect," ſays the former of theſe Prelates, addreſſing himſelf to his Clergy, "that when you are inſtituted to a benefice you do not ſay that you will execute the office by yourſelves, or by your ſufficient *deputy*. No: The Biſhop does in the moſt expreſs terms commit to *you*, and to *you only*, the cure of the ſouls of that pariſh, and you muſt in *your own perſons* be anſwerable for their ſalvation[t]." There is too, in the caſe of Vicars, the obligation of an expreſs Oath to this effect[v]. "Reſidence is alſo made neceſſary by the unequivocal Law of the land[w]."

"When we look," ſays the Biſhop of Oſſory, "to the cauſes of the extinction of the Church of Rome, in ſo many countries, at the time of the Reformation, the declarations, even of their own hiſtorians, will direct us to ſearch for them, principally, in the neglect of their Clergy to attend to their parochial duties, and to the more private and ordinary obligations of the Paſtoral care[x]." A leading act of our Reformers therefore was to make a law requiring the reſidence of miniſters on their reſpective cures. Their wiſ-

---

(q) Charge, London, 1790, ſecond Edition, p. 12. (r) See the Biſhop of Oſſory's Charge, reprinted at London, 1797. (s) See the form of Inſtitution. (t) Charge as above. (v) See the above form, and Burn's Eccles. Law, Vol. i. p. 164. (w) See Burn Vol. iii. p. 295. (x) Charge, p. 46.

dom in ſo doing, the venerable Lord Kenyon affirms, none can doubt. Even the Biſhop's diſpenſing with reſidence, his Lordſhip obſerves, does not alter the Law on the ſubject. "But independent of this," he adds, "upon *every moral* man's mind there muſt be a ſenſe of duty impreſſed, that he ought not to receive the emoluments of his ſituation, without, as far as he is able, diſcharging the duties of it [y]."

Attention to this duty is moreover ſtrenuouſly recommended by the unanimous voice of our moſt eminent Prelates [z]. In ſhort, as the Biſhop of London expreſſes it, "Nothing but extreme ill health, or ſome other equally juſt and powerful impediment, can excuſe an Incumbent from that reſidence which is required by the laws of the land both civil and eccleſiaſtical, as well as by every motive that can bind the conſcience, or influence the conduct of an honeſt man [a]."

In ſpite however of all this, Dr. Croft, the Vicar of Arncliffe, is a ſtrenuous advocate for Non-Reſidence. According to his ſublime morality, theſe obligations may be all conſcientiouſly neglected. In his judgment, this moſt weighty duty of a miniſter towards his pariſh may be faithfully diſcharged although he ſeldom comes near it.

"The evils of non-reſidence and pluralities," he ſays, "are common ſubjects of declamation. . . . But were the hopes of eccleſiaſtics ſtill more contracted, all the great abilities of the Country would have recourſe to other profeſſions and callings [b]." "In the rage for reforming, *many pleas for non-reſidence* were omitted, ſtronger than ſome of thoſe which are allowed. I humbly conceive, notwithſtanding, that more latitude of conſtruction is admiſſible. Be this as it may, (that is, clearly, be the *law* what it may) let benignity

(y) See Note (i) 220, above. (z) Beſides the Charges already mentioned, ſee thoſe of the Biſhops of Durham, Rocheſter, Lincoln, Exeter; and to uſe this laſt Prelate's language, "almoſt every charge of every Biſhop." (a) Ch. p. 11. (b) Thoughts, &c. p. 36.

in the ordinary, and in all other persons concerned, supply the defect [c]."

The pleas suggested by the Dr. which the legislature has omitted, are, "any unfortunate dispute concerning tithes," and the consideration how little towards a reformation of his parish the incumbent himself can effect!! In the former case, "it is certainly," he says, "much more advisable" for the minister "to change the place of his residence, and to live where he can live in peace and tranquillity [d]."

Those Prelates who are strenuous in requiring attention to this duty, Dr. C. abuses; and reminds them, that "the great concern of Bishops is not to impose improper restraints, or to fasten harsh imputations upon the body of the clergy [e]." In answer to Archbishop Secker, who, in a passage quoted by Mr. Gisborne, censures Pluralists who do not comply with the express condition of the instrument of their dispensation [z], Dr. C. asks, "Whether His Grace reflected how inconvenient and expensive this would prove to many?" "Let the bond therefore," he says, "be abrogated, and while the clergy do all they can in their respective stations, let them oppose with unremitting zeal the narrow rules of ecclesiastical Martinets, who having found a smooth and easy path to liberal emolument, calmly recommend disinterestedness and humility to others, and would lay upon them burdens grievous to be borne [f]."

"Still," he adds, "the wickedness of the world is owing to the non-residence of the clergy . . Surely men's abilities and exertions are not to be measured by their incomes. Therefore why so much declamation against Curates [g]?" The declamation is not against Curates, but against Principals for absenting themselves; and with many weighty reasons for this complaint, Dr. C. may be supplied by the Bishop of

(c) Thoughts, &c. p. 38. (d) Ibid. p. 45. (e) Strictures on Paley and Gisborne, p. 142. (z) See Burn, Vol. iii. Ch. on Plurality, p. 108. (f) Ibid. p. 151. (g) Thoughts, p. 44.

London. The conclusion of his Lordship's remarks on the subject runs thus: "In short, let him (the Principal) be ever so careful in the choice of his substitute, is he prepared to answer, as he must, at the tribunal of Christ, for every neglect that has happened, every soul that has been lost among those committed to his care, and whom perhaps he has never seen or thought of for months and years together? This is a most awful consideration; and I leave it to the serious attention of every one whom it concerns[h]." Now, it is unnecessary to add, that Dr. Croft's sentiments are not singular on this head.

Leaving then every other part of a minister's duty, every other reason the Dr. may have for wishing that charges from the Bishops to the Clergy might be delivered in private, or in Latin[i]; this we must insist upon, that they who thus vindicate and plead for the *violation of, the laws of the land*, the *laws of the church*, the *express condition* on which they are instituted to their benefits, the *admonitions of their Ordinary*, their *own solemn Oath*, and "*every motive that can bind the conscience, or influence the conduct of an honest man*," must for ever be silent about inculcating STRICT MORALITY.

Another duty of immense importance to society is that of *Veracity*.——In proportion as men deviate from Truth they destroy mutual confidence, throw every thing into confusion, and utterly unfit themselves for converse with each other. There is, accordingly, scarce any virtue more urgently recommended to Christians, than universal sincerity and simplicity in their deportment[k]; there is no vice against which the laws of Christ are more awfully severe, than every species of lying[l].

Are then these guardians of morals *strict* on this point? No.

(h) Ch. p. 13. (i) See his Strictures, p. 155; and Thoughts, p. 38. (k) See Mat. v. 37; 2 Cor. i. 12; ii. 27; Titus ii. 8, 9. (l) John viii. 44; Acts v. 3, 4; Rev. xxi. 8.

There may be cases according to Dr. Croft's casuistry, when this abomination to the Lord is absolutely necessary.—Speaking of the conduct of Medical Gentlemen toward their patients, Mr. Gisborne properly observes, "They are at liberty to say little, but let that little be true. St. Paul's direction 'not to do evil that good may come,' is clear, positive, and universal." Dr. Croft's stricture here is, "There may be cases in which it may be absolutely necessary to DECEIVE a patient[m]." He talks also of "a PARDONABLE LYE[n]." "The casuistry of lying," however he thinks, "is not in all instances regularly adjusted. Some," he says, "have made it malum per se. If this were the case, it could no more be allowable to lye under any circumstances than it could be to commit fornication or adultery." But "*to tell a lye for charity*, &c." he says, "hath not only been done at all times, but commended by great, and wise, and good men[o]." This surely rather resembles apology for the violation of the duty of veracity, than strictness upon it.

The celebrated moralist, Archdeacon Paley, also enumerates a large class of direct and intentional "falsehoods which" he says, "are not lies," and "not criminal[p]." Amongst these are specified "jests," "tales to create mirth," "a servant's denying his master," affirmations "where the person you speak to has no right to know the truth, or more properly where little or no inconvenience arises from the want of confidence," discourse to children, &c. "for their own advantage," &c. &c[q]. "Many people," he observes, "indulge in serious discourse a habit of fiction and exaggeration." Such persons then it might appear, certainly violate the precepts of scripture respecting veracity. But no: "So long," the Dr. says, "as the facts they relate are indifferent, and their narratives, though false, are inoffensive, it may seem a superstitious regard to truth, to censure them

(m) Strictures, p. 163. (n) Ibid. p. 6. (o) Ibid. p. 35. Note.
(p) Moral and Polit. Phil. Ch. on Lies, p. 154, 155. (q) Ibid.

merely for truth's ſake." He expreſſes however ſome faint diſapprobation of this conduct, and adds, "White lies always introduce others of a darker complexion[r]." This to ſome perſons would appear a ſufficient reaſon why ſuch lies ſhould be prohibited. But clearly, whatever may be the conveniency of this Divine's morality, it has no claim to ſtrictneſs.

Very ſimilar are the notions of Profeſſor Hey on the point.——"Veracity," the Dr. ſays, "may perhaps be moſt conveniently defined, an *habitual* abſtinence from falſehood." And "falſehood," he adds, "is deceiving thoſe whom we undertake to inform, by the uſe of ſigns, agreed upon between us[s]." To tell a lie *occaſionally* therefore is no breach of this duty; nor is there any guilt in deceiving all who do not come under theſe circumſtances.——In illuſtrating this definition, and proving how frequently there is apparent, and no real falſehood, the learned Profeſſor ſhows, how, without ſpeaking falſehood, we may uſe words in a ſenſe as different from their literal and obvious ſignification, as it would be "to call the Sun by the name of Moon, and the Moon by the name of Sun[t];" or of courſe, to call white black, and black white!

Among other inſtances of this kind which are produced, we have again that of a ſervant's denying his maſter; that is, ſaying, "My maſter is not at home, when his maſter is really within[v]." "Arch-biſhop Secker, being aſked about this matter," the Dr. ſays, he has been told, "anſwered," "The *firſt* man that uſed this excuſe when he was really at home, told a lie[w]." And can there be a doubt but that nine times out of ten when it is uſed, it is a lie ſtill? There has certainly been no expreſs and general agreement that theſe ſigns or words ſhould perfectly change their meaning; nor have they tacitly, or by any other method, acquired a new

(r) Ibid. p. 157. (s) Vol. ii. p. 8. (t) Ibid. p. 11.
(v) Ibid. p. 12. (w) Ibid.

meaning which is so generally understood either in town or country, that nine persons out of ten would not be *deceived* by it. The person using them in such a sense would therefore, in general, deceive those he undertook to inform, and according to the Dr.'s own definition would be guilty of falsehood. The same might, of course, be shown of every similar instance.

And how different, how exceedingly different, is all this from the injunction of our Divine Master, "Let your communication be, yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil [x]." And what a door does it not open for subterfuge and evasion! Whatever may be its effects upon learned casuists in their studies, should such principles obtain in common life, what hold could mankind have of each other?

The evil however assumes a still more solemn aspect when an "Oath for confirmation" is concerned. This is the highest security for good conduct that mankind can possibly obtain from each other. In proportion as the obligations of an Oath are relaxed, peace, property, reputation, and life itself, are endangered. Whoever therefore attempts to tamper with truth under these circumstances, whoever, in any degree, weakens this solemn bond, does in that degree, the very greatest mischief to society.

Yet whether these Sticklers for the *social virtues* are clear in this matter, highly deserves their consideration. To some persons it appears, that their doctrines and conduct must have this tendency, in respect to, the Oath of allegiance explained as above [y]; the Oaths respecting residence already noticed [z]; that against Simony which regards the purchase of presentations and advowsons, a practice which Dr. Croft also defends [a]; and their solemn engagements to teach according to the plain and literal meaning of articles, the plain

(x) Mat. v. 37. (y) Above, p. 246. (z) Above, p. 252—254.
(a) Thoughts, p. 44.

and literal meaning of which they either profeſſedly reject or ingeniouſly evade [b].——We ſtop not further to ſhow how diametrically oppoſite their conduct, in each of theſe inſtances, is, to the expreſs terms and tenour of their engagements. Neither ſay we how far, under ſuch circumſtances, they may fancy themſelves ſincere. But, whatever becomes of integrity, for thoſe who act thus to pretend to *ſtrictneſs* in morality, is an inſult to common ſenſe.

A further Virtue belonging to this claſs, and to which our opponents lay an excluſive claim is that of *Candour*. Having engaged to teach one ſpecific body of doctrine, which we believe to be agreeable to God's word, to this we conceive it our duty to adhere; and we dare not, like them, "not eſteem any particular opinion concerning the euchariſt, the trinity, ſatisfaction, and original ſin," eſſential to ſalvation [d]; and affirm after our ſubſcription to an Athanaſian Creed, that "Pelagius was a true Chriſtian [e]:" As Miniſters of a Church which inculcates the neceſſity of practical Chriſtianity [f], and as Stewards of thoſe Oracles which declare, that "without holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord [g]," we dare not cry "peace, peace" to the wicked, and thoſe who are mere nominal Chriſtians: We dare not aſpire after that Candour which does away the turpitude of a man's own conduct by "tolerating all the vices committed by others [h]:" We dare not affect "that ſenſeleſs cant of charity, which inſults the underſtandings, and trifles with the feelings of thoſe who are really concerned for the happineſs of their fellow-creatures [i]:" We dare not, in ſhort, encourage any to conſider themſelves Chriſtians indeed, except thoſe who actually believe the doctrines, and, in the ha-

(b) See above, Chap. i. §. 2; Chap. 2; and below, Chap. viii. §. 1. (d) See Biſhop Watſon's Charge, 1795, p. 66. (e) Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 142. (f) See Chap. iii. (g) Heb. xii. 14. (h) See Strictures on Female Education, p. 37. (i) Practical View, &c. p. 432

bitual tenour of their lives, comply with the precepts, of Chriſt. Neither dare we, after their manner, explain away the ſtrong language of Scripture and our Church, reſpecting the puniſhment of finally impenitent ſinners, and ſuggeſt our doubts whether "*all men*" may not "be happy ultimately [k]." It is, we conceive, infinitely more ſafe and more becoming, to imitate Chriſt and his Apoſtle, and "perſuade men" "to flee from the wrath to come [l]."

Hence, we are repreſented by our opponents as harſh and illiberal bigots, men "who with uncharitable zeal deal damnation round the land [m]." "It certainly is our opinion," ſay the Antijacobin Reviewers, "that no man ever did, nor ever will, write decidedly, on the Calviniſtic ſide of the queſtion, as becomes a Gentleman, a Scholar, and a Chriſtian. ... It ſeems to be of the eſſence of their principles to render thoſe who hold them ſour and uncharitable [n]." Theſe Gentlemen, on the contrary, make high pretenſions to candour and liberality of ſentiment; "thank God that they feel no portion of that odium theologicum," which leads divines "to ſpeak harſhly or diſreſpectfully of thoſe who may happen to diſſent from them;" and value themſelves on "creating conciliation and promoting peace, by recommending mutual forbearance [o]." A very few ſpecimens however will ſhew that they have little ground for this boaſt.

Candour, in its genuine ſcriptural import, is, the treating the principles, actions, and characters of others as favourably as is conſiſtent with what, after proper inquiry, we eſteem truth, and a good conſcience. It is therefore ſomething perfectly diſtinct from *indifference* to all principles

(k) Above, p. 138; and Nor. Lect. Vol. ii. p. 390. (l) 2 Cor. v. 11; and Mat. iii. 7. (m) See Dr Croft's Thoughts, p. 49; Antijac. Review, for April, 1799, p. 367—9; Mr. Clapham's Sermon; &c. (n) See Rev. for November, 1799, p. 259. (o) See Daubeny's Appendix, p. 637; Croft's Strictures; &c.

and all actions. It is compatible with every other divine precept, and is therefore compatible with "contending earneſtly for the faith[p]," and "abhorring that which is evil[q]."

But firſt, a *captious diſputatious* mode of procedure, a diſpoſition to make a man an offender for a word, a cenſuring with ſeverity what is unimportant, or doubtful, or not ſufficiently underſtood by us, every thing that reſembles "beholding the mote in our brother's eye and neglecting the beam in our own[r]," is certainly a violation of this duty. Yet of this kind is much of the conduct of theſe divines. Mr. Ludlam's ſhall ſerve as a ſpecimen.

Thus then, when Mr. Robinſon remarks, "that men are unwilling to *accept* the ſalvation provided for them," Mr. Ludlam produces it as an evidence of his extreme confuſion and obſcurity, and exclaims, "juſt as if ſalvation reſembled any other gift[s]!" Yet only three pages before Mr. L. himſelf mentioning Chriſt, ſpeaks of "the benefits vouchſafed to ſuch as *accept* his ſalvation." And in another place, he ſpeaks of thoſe who "are inclined to receive the Redeemer and *accept* his ſalvation[t]." Now on what principle, ſave a diſpoſition at all events to cavil, Mr. L. can object to a term in Mr. Robinſon's divinity, which he repeatedly uſes in his own, he will ſcarcely explain to us.

Of the ſame kind, but ſomewhat worſe, is Mr. L's treatment of this Divine's expreſſions and ſentiments reſpecting the Union of believers with Chriſt, the Spirit, Grace, &c. when he only uſes the common language of our moſt celebrated divines on theſe ſubjects[v]. Of the ſame kind is his ſevere cenſure of Mr. Milner reſpecting juſtification, who he ſays, "cannot ſee the difference between pardon and acquittal[w];" when a main object with Mr. M. is to make

(p) Jude iii. (q) Rom. xii. 9. (r) See Mat. vii. 3—5. (s) Four Eſſays, p. 105. (t) Six Eſſays, p. 45. (v) See above, Ch. vi. §. 3. (w) Six Eſſays, p. 56, and above, p. 182.

this diſtinction, and to inſiſt on the neceſſity of the latter, which Mr. L. conſiders impoſſible.

A general charge advanced by Mr. L. againſt thoſe who are the objects of his ſtrictures, is their *poſitiveneſs*. "The whole tribe" of them, he ſays, miſtake "the poſitiveneſs of opinion for the convictions of reaſon[x]." "They have treated thoſe," he ſays again, "who only deſired to know their meaning with all the arrogant aſſurance of papal infallibility, and all the crocodile compaſſion of inquiſitorial bigotry[y]."——Yet the ordinary ſtyle in which his dogmas are enforced amounts to this; "it *is* ſo, and *muſt* be ſo; it *is* ſo, and *can* be no otherwiſe:" His ordinary method of characterizing every contrary ſentiment is, to denominate it "abſurd," "unintelligible," or "impoſſible."

Thus, in oppoſition to Mr. Robinſon, and the generally prevailing ſentiments of the Orthodox on theſe points, he ſays, "God is, and only *can* be God by office, whatever may be ſaid[z]." "The moral obligation of his creatures,... to yield him a willing obedience, ariſes, and *can only* ariſe, from the benefits he has been graciouſly pleaſed to beſtow upon them[a]." "Love *only does*, it *only can*, ſpring from love[b]." "It *can only* be for *our* ſakes, that he will permit the worſhip of no other object, and that he will not give his glory to another[c]."

The common explanation of the doctrine of the atonement, which ſuppoſes "the ſins of mankind to be tranſferred to Jeſus," Mr. L. ſays, is "*abſurd* and *unfounded*[d]." "Were ſuch tranſlation," he adds, "*poſſible*, the word character could *not poſſibly* have *any idea* affixed to it, or be capable of *any ſignification*. For character *is*, and *muſt* be perſonal; it ariſes, and *can only* ariſe from the con-

(x) Four Eſſays, p. 44 (y) Ibid. p. 60. (z) Ibid. p. 69.
(a) Ibid. p. 74. (b) Six Eſſays, p. 46. (c) Ibid. p. 40.
(d) Ibid. p. 37, Note.

duct of the individual; and *can* no more be transferred or imputed to him, than the actions or conſciouſneſs of one man, can be made the actions, or conſciouſneſs of another man. To ſupport this *abſurd*, and *impoſſible* notion, the ſufferings of Chriſtare called by thoſe who maintain it, what they never are called in ſcripture, a puniſhment, though they *neither had*, nor *could poſſibly* have, any thing but pain in common with puniſhment [e]." And the ſpeaking of God "as being pleaſed with, delighting in, and receiving complacency from" theſe ſufferings, is, he ſays, to attribute to him "the more than *ſavage brutality* of the Roman Soldiers [f]." And the remark reſpecting this opinion quoted by Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. L. tells us, "is both *falſe* and *fooliſh* [g]."

Again, "The curſe of the law," mentioned Galatians iii. 13. Mr. L. ſays, "*cannot* mean the puniſhment annexed to the violation of the Chriſtian law: and whatever may be meant by Chriſt's being made a curſe for us, in order to obtain our redemption, it *cannot* be underſtood of his ſuffering the penalty of *any* law [h]." In explaining his own meaning on the above paſſage, in reſpect to Chriſt's death, the Apoſtle, Mr. L obſerves, "ſays nothing about the *mode* of its operation about *any tranſlation of guilt, any commutation of puniſhment, any ſtanding in our law-place:* matters either UTTERLY IMPOSSIBLE, or UTTERLY UNINTELLIGIBLE [i]."

All this, ſurely, is poſitiveneſs in the extreme; and Mr. L.'s cenſure of others for this fault, ſtrongly reminds us of the quick-ſightedneſs reprehended by our Lord [k], but by no means of the candour commended by his Apoſtle [l].

But to proceed to what is unequivocal on the point. If there be ſuch a fault as the violation of the law of candour, it is the involving in one general and unſupported

(e) Ibid. (f) Ibid. and p. 37. (g) Ibid. (h) Ibid. p. 19.
(i) Ibid. p. 22. (k) Mat. vii. 3. (l) 1 Cor. xiii.

charge of weak or wicked, whole bodies of men who differ from us, and continually loading them with harſh imputations, and opprobrious names. Yet this is the manner in which theſe Gentlemen treat the objects of their ſtrictures. If their candid portrait of us is correct, we are a body of weak enthuſiaſts and deſigning hypocrites; a claſs of men, not only deſtitute of learning, reaſon, and morality, but who depreciate, revile, and reject theſe attainments; a ſpecies of monſters or lunatics, who neither think, nor feel, nor act, like rational creatures. A few paſſages, taken from numberleſs others to the ſame effect, ſhall ſubſtantiate this aſſertion.

Thus then, Mr. Ludlam, oppoſing Dr. Knox, ſays, "But he had a ſyſtem to maintain, and then *adieu to ſenſe, meaning, context, connection, grammar, and ſometimes to* COMMON HONESTY [m]." And this too, he ſays, with an immediate reference to the very excellent and candid Mr. Hervey! And for what? Truly, for affirming that our ninth Article teaches that, "Original ſin is the fault and corruption of every man that naturally is engendered of the offſpring of Adam [n]!!"——The ſame candid charge, in nearly the very ſame words, Mr. L. prefers againſt Mr. Robinſon, and, in effect, againſt the whole claſs of ſuch writers, in his former work [o]. In another place he thus tauntingly exclaims: "The piety of certain perſons is right, becauſe their faith is true; and their faith is true, becauſe their piety is right. No wonder Mr. Joſeph Milner and his friends ſhould reject reaſon and reprobate Locke [p]."

Under a vaſt deal of pretenſions to Candour, and Gentlemanſhip, and Brotherly kindneſs, it requires the utmoſt ſtretch of Mr Daubeny's charity to believe any profeſſors of Chriſtianity in a ſtate of ſalvation who differ from him in external matters: At the beſt, they can only, he main-

(m) Six Eſſays, p. 58. (n) Ibid. Note. (o) Four Eſſays, p. 89. (p) Ibid. p. 64.

tains, be left to the *uncovenanted* mercies of God[q]. He would perſuade his reader that he has qualified "him to form a decided opinion on his ſubject," "by an appeal to hiſtoric fact[r]," when this *hiſtoric fact* conſiſts only of a few *partial* and ſometimes wholly *inadmiſſible* extracts, and when the main body of legitimate and deciſively contrary evidence on the point is not ſo much as glanced at[s]. He details falſe and malignant repreſentations of his opponent's ſentiments, which are collected from the writings of profeſſed ſcorners[t]. He almoſt conſtantly grounds his reaſonings and concluſions upon conſequences deduced from their doctrines, which they do not admit[m]. He charges them expreſsly with maintaining "a religious ſyſtem, conſiſting of human creatures without liberty, doctrines without ſenſe, faith without reaſon, and a God without mercy[v];" a ſyſtem which "teareth up the very foundation of religion, induceth all manner of profaneneſs in the world[w]," and is "an artifice of the Devil[x]; &c. &c."——So much reaſon has Mr. Daubeny to "thank God" for his great attainments in Candour, and the poſſeſſion of a "temper" which will not ſuffer him "to offend," or "to ſpeak harſhly or diſreſpectfully of thoſe" who differ from him[y]! With ſuch propriety is this writer puffed off as a perfect model of theſe virtues[z]!

Dr. Croft's common appellations for us are thoſe of "fanatical divines;" "clerical enthuſiaſts;" "enthuſiaſtic preachers, who have received epiſcopal ordination[a]."

(q) Guide, p. 178—182; and paſſim. (r) Appendix, p. 262. (s) Compare his Appendix, Letter 4, with Chap. ii. §. ii. above. (t) Guide, p. 81; and Sir R. Hill's 4th Letter. (m) See Appendix, p. 222. (v) Ibid. 249. (w) Guide. p. 81. (x) Appendix, p. 303. (y) See Appendix, p. 637. (z) See the Review of his works, and thoſe which they have occaſioned, in the Antijacobin. (a) See his Thoughts, p. 29, 31; and Strictures, p. 145.

The objects of Mr. Polwhele's ſtrictures are, "Sanctified denouncers of damnation," "hypocrites," "liars," "fools," "knaves," "rogues and debauchees[b]." After certain hints, in Mr. P.'s manner, about "favours, preſents," &c. from "*elect ladies*, and *honourable women*," he proceeds thus: "This familiar intercourſe of the teachers with their people, muſt often be improved into an union of the ſexes, as refined as that of Father Confeſſors with their relenting daughters.... Whilſt the paſtors are thus occupied, the lambs run mad; the reſt are wolves in ſheep's clothing—in other words, the more ignorant part of the Lord's people are actually deprived of their ſenſes, and the wiſer turn rogues and debauchees.... Amidſt the doubts of his diſtracted followers, the chambering and wantonneſs of the ſanctified denouncer of damnation are brought forward into open day[c]." Speaking immediately of Dr. Hawker, his *doctrines* Mr. P. ſays, are "moſt abſurd and dangerous," "impious, blaſphemous[d]!" His *Chriſtian* "returns home in deſpondency,.. unfitted for the commerce of life, and dreading the approach of death;" or "looks down, with ſupercilious contempt, even on his neareſt relations; and, damning them to eternal perdition, exults in the bleſſedneſs of the ſaints[e]." And as to *himſelf*, he has "relinquiſhed all pretenſions to the character of a gentleman;" he is "a perſon whom gentlemen muſt deſpiſe and ſhun;" "a crowd-catcher," "an enthuſiaſt," "a fanatic," a "hypocrite," under the influence of "madneſs," and likely "in a puff, to expire an atheiſt[f]." &c. &c.

In this manner writes the Vicar of Manaccan, with the "ſole view," as he tells us, "to promote the glory of God, and the edification of his people[g]." In this ſtrain writes

(b) Letter, p. 63, Note; 79—83; and 3d. Letter, p. 15. (c) Ibid. (d) Letter, p. 41. (e) Ibid. p. 58. (f) Third Letter. p. 6, 15, 17, 22; 2nd. Letter, p. 12, 18, 30. (g) Second Letter, p. 24.

Mr. Polwhele, who, at the same time, reminds us, "that when our Saviour was reviled, he reviled not again [h];" and who gravely says, "Let us no more interfere with one another in the spirit of contention; but let each individual pursue his course, according to his belief and his conscience... Let us look on our fellow-Christians with eyes of candour, of compassion, and of brotherly love; ready to make allowances for the infirmities common to many, and to assist our weaker brethren by every act of kindness [i]." In this style does Mr. P. treat a divine, whom he once publicly characterized "eloquent," "ingenious and pious;" to whom he has expressed "a lively sense of obligation, which he felt in common with the rest of the public, for an Author who had delighted and informed his mind;" and of whom he still says, that he is "the most popular preacher in the diocese [k]." But Dr. Hawker has, it seems, perfectly changed his theological sentiments. "In your 'Sermons on the divinity of our Saviour,' Mr. P., addressing the Dr., says, "you tell us, that 'our best deeds are largely tinctured with a mixture of infirmity.' But in your later publications you affirm, that 'we cannot do a good deed, or even think a good thought,' and that 'we are wholly corrupt and depraved in our highest attainments BY NATURE.' Quantum mutatus ab illo!" Mr. P. therefore exclaims. "And yet," he adds, "it seems, because I once praised you, I must pursue you still, through all your changes, with applause [l]!" These are Mr. Polwhele's expressions of admiration. Perhaps the reader may now think it his turn to admire.

Our Antijacobin friends highly applaud Mr. P.'s achievements; and, precisely after his manner, style us "Sepa-

(h) Lett. p. 77. (i) Ibid. p. 90. (k) See Mr. P's. Review of Dr. Hawker's Sermons on the Divinity of Christ, in the English Review for April, 1793; and Mr. P's 2nd. Letter, p. 13—18; 3rd Letter, p. 6. (l) Second Letter, p. 30. Note.

ratiſts," "Sectaries," "Seceders," "Methodiſts," "Schiſmatics," "Deceivers[m]," &c.——The Author whom Mr. Clapham ſo "earneſtly recommends," is, if poſſible, more abuſive. His impartial repreſentation of us is, that we "ſet up faith in oppoſition to a good life;" "make war upon reaſon and upon all the plain duties of man;" grant men "a diſpenſation from the obſervance of the moral law of God;" "open the proſpect of everlaſting happineſs to ſinners of every degree without an abſolute forſaking of their ſins," and "go a recruiting for the Devil;" and that "all they can know of our preaching is, that it is not a good life," that "it is ſomething very averſe to morality [c]."

All this ſurely is a ſingular method of "creating conciliation, promoting peace, and recommending mutual forbearance!" Surely it was not thus our Divine Maſter taught his diſciples "to love one another!" Can the utmoſt ſtretch of Candour itſelf conſider all this candid? We, doubtleſs, may be defective in regard to this virtue, but we muſt out-herod Herod to exceed this degree of violation of it.

We will only further juſt mention the virtue of charity, as it conſiſts in *Benevolence* and *Beneficence* toward our fellow-creatures.——To this virtue our opponents alſo make high pretenſions, and repreſent our doctrines as hoſtile to it. We ſee not however any traits of ſuperior ſtrictneſs on this head, in their treatment of their theological antagoniſts, already noticed [d]. We recognize no extraordinary concern for the temporal and ſpiritual welfare of their pariſhes in their arguments for habitual abſence from them [e]. There is nothing here which reminds us of the Apoſtle's affirmation, "I ſeek not your's, but you." This principle ſeems

(m) Review for April, 1799, p. 361; and June, p. 211, 212,
(c) Page, 13—28. (d) Page 259, &c. (e) Above, p. 253, &c.

rather to be inverted, and thoſe of pure ſelfiſhneſs to be acted upon. We perceive not how this zeal for men's moſt important intereſts, they would be thought to poſſeſs, is compatible with their extreme ſeverity againſt the errors of zeal in others, and their indifference to thoſe of idleneſs and dereliction of duty. Yet ſo it is, a fellow-miniſter ſcarcely can render himſelf an object of their general reprehenſion through careleſsneſs, but if any are led to act or ſpeak indiſcreetly through zeal in the execution of their office, all mouths are open againſt them, and they are immediately ſhunned as Enthuſiaſts and Fanatics.

And yet, ſurely here, if any where, it becomes us to act "with all our might." Unleſs we will admit, what ſo many would inſinuate, that our religion is indeed all "ſtate-craft and prieſtcraft," a mere contrivance to over-awe the multitude; unleſs we will admit that our doctrines reſpecting a future ſtate are, in themſelves, of no importance at all, we muſt admit that their importance is immenſe, and that in proportion to this importance ſhould be our exertions in inculcating them. Charity towards men, it ſhould be conſidered, is very different from a partiality for them, when judging of their religious ſtate and character. The latter is generally the effect of mere ſelfiſhneſs, and diſpoſes us to conclude favourably concerning them without ſufficient evidence; the former is diſintereſted and ſolicitous reſpecting their welfare, not ſo much diſpoſed to believe the objects of it ſafe and happy already, as to uſe every endeavour to make them ſo.

Let the reader ſay whether party he would be moſt inclined to ſuſpect of want of charity, from the following deſcription given of his opponents by Mr. Polwhele. "They affect," Mr. P. ſays, "a more than ordinary degree of charity towards their unfortunate brethren. Leading honeſt labourers and artificers aſtray by the ſeductive power of their eloquence, they work the ruin of numerous families; and then put the rich under contribution, in order to

relieve the neceſſities of the poor. They inſtitute aſylums and hoſpitals; and move heaven and earth in ſupport of their charitable foundations; over which they 'reign as kings.' In favour of an alms-houſe, they ſolicit the great, and circumvent the lowly; impoſe on credulous men, and 'lead captive ſilly women;'—'damn' the ſinner, and deify the ſaint; adminiſter medicines to the ſick, and dictate the wills of the dying [z]."——Now *ſome* credit is due to the repreſentation of an opponent. Strip then this account of the colouring, which poſſibly a want of charity may have given it, and we have the ſtrong teſtimony of Mr. P. in proof of the extraordinary charitable exertions of the perſons cenſured. At any rate, this is ſurely a curious charge to prefer againſt thoſe, who, at other times, are repreſented, as making religion conſiſt almoſt wholly in faith and devotion, and as regardleſs of that part of it which enjoins charity towards man [y].

But what ſhall we ſay of the extent and diſintereſtedneſs of Mr. Ludlam's morality on this point? "There is nothing *morally* wrong," this advocate for exalted charity affirms, "in him who feels more acutely for the loſs of a little finger, than for all thoſe who periſh in a great battle in Germany, by an earthquake in Italy, or the plague in Turkey [f]." Mr. L.'s. proof of this doctrine is, "becauſe neither reaſon nor revelation command a man to love his neighbour *more* than himſelf."—But to do this, he muſt feel more acutely for his neighbour's loſs of his *little finger*, than for the loſs of his own. But the man who conceives there is nothing morally wrong in being more affected about ſuch a trifle which concerns himſelf, than the deſtruction of many thouſands of his fellow-creatures, muſt ſurely diſclaim high pretenſions to philanthropy. Such a miniſter of the goſpel is little likely "very gladly to ſpend

(z) Letter, p. 78. (y) See above. p. 234—236. (f) Six Eſſays, p. 108.

and be ſpent [g]" for the good of others; or, if occaſion ſhould require it, " to lay down his life for his brethren [h]."

And ought that Miniſter of Jeſus to boaſt of ſuperior Chriſtian charity, who is an Apologiſt for that ſtigma of our renowned nation, that monſtrous traffic in human fleſh, the African Slave Trade!—Yet ſuch is Dr. Croft. Thus, ſpeaking on the ſubject, he ſays, " What evils they (the Negroes) really labour under, is not in my power to determine.... Particular inſtances of cruelty will no more be concluſive againſt planters in general, than Mrs. Brownrigge's conduct, againſt all maſters and miſtreſſes of pariſh apprentices. Appeals to Scripture are worſe than uſeleſs; it is ſomewhat profane to appeal to a ſentence which has never been pronounced by the ſacred penman. To make it kidnapping, is to aggravate the guilt of it, whatever that guilt may be, and without an actual ſurvey of the iſlands no adequate judgment can be formed.... The advocates for abolition have certainly accumulated much unmerited abuſe upon the planters.... If we can abate the virulence of mutual invective, an intermediate way will probably be found, which may ſatisfy the wiſhes of all parties, and be *perfectly conſiſtent* with the benign ſpirit of the Chriſtian religion [i]." This is inculcating univerſal benevolence with a witneſs.

This then is the ground theſe Divines have for congratulating themſelves, ſuſpecting the church, and cenſuring us, in regard to the RULE OF MORALS.——WE, in ſtrict adherence to our Guide, preſcribe a *perfect ſtandard*, even the whole moral law of God. Perfect conformity in heart and conduct to this law, we maintain, is the duty of all men; and that after this conformity they ought continually to labour.——THEY, in the ſtead of this, ſubſtitute

(g) 2 Cor. xii. 15. (h) 1 John, iii. 16.
(i) Preface to Strictures, p. 6. 7.

ſome vague and indeterminate rule of conduct, which they call *ſincerity*: They inſiſt not upon the *converſion and renovation of the heart*, in thoſe who have been educated Chriſtians: They account little of the immediate duties of the *whole firſt table* of the law, or allow them only a ſecondary importance: They cenſure us for our ſtrictneſs in regard to what chiefly concerns a *man's ſelf*, and tolerate various kinds of public diſſipation: And, ſo far are they from being ſtrict on thoſe branches of morality into which they nearly reſolve he whole of it, on the *relative* and *ſocial* virtues; ſo lax are the notions of ſome of them on the duties of ſubjects to their governors, and of miniſters to their people; ſo little reaſon have they for boaſting, with reſpect to the virtues of Veracity, Candour, and Charity.

Hence it is, that, as the eminent Biſhop Horſley obſerves to his Clergy, when a man affirms that he "is a *moral man*, he means nothing more than that "he is no murderer, no adulterer, no thief, no liar, no ſpendthrift[k]." Yet this is the morality concerning which we hear ſuch a continual boaſt! Theſe are the good works which are to contribute ſo much toward obtaining heaven and immortality! "With nothing more of the Chriſtian character about him," his Lordſhip proceeds, "than is ſuppoſed to be contained in the negation of theſe crimes, he (i. e. ſuch a profeſſor of Chriſtianity) hopes to find admiſſion into the kingdom of heaven; for, if at any time he hath chanced to drop in, while you have been preaching, he has heard you tell your congregation that Morality is all in all[l]."

(k) Charge, p. 22. (l) Ibid.

SECTION II.

Concerning the SANCTIONS *of Morality.*

BUT, it is of little importance, it will be ſaid, what our Standard of Morality is, if we deſtroy its *Sanctions*, and diſpenſe with its *neceſſity*. Let us examine then whether or not this is in any degree the caſe? Good works, we have maintained, are neither the *meritorious cauſe*, nor the *appointed condition* of juſtification. Let us inquire whether it from hence follows, that we have either no neceſſary uſe for them, or no proper ſanctions by which we enforce them. The body of thoſe whom our doctrines concern conſtitute two claſſes, the righteous and the wicked, or believers and unbelievers; it may be proper therefore to attend to their bearings on each of theſe claſſes of men.

Now, it muſt be admitted, that this doctrine of juſtification, will have the ſame aſpect on morals, when taught by us, which it has when taught preciſely in the ſame manner, by our church. In whatever way therefore *ſhe* can inculcate morality conſiſtently with it, *we* can conſiſtently imitate her. The church too, it has appeared, is in ſome degree implicated in the charge to be refuted[m]. To her procedure on the ſubject we will therefore particularly attend.

And firſt, Our church ſecures the intereſts, and inculcates the neceſſity of morality, by conſidering Good Works the *natural fruit*, and *neceſſary effect*, of that faith which juſtifies.

On this point ſhe is moſt full and deciſive. "By all the

(m) Above, p. 221.

declaration of St. Paul," ſhe ſays, "it is evident, that the true, lively, and Chriſtian faith, is no dead, vain, or unfruitful thing, but a thing of perfect virtue, of wonderful operation and ſtrength, bringing forth all good motions and good works[n]." "True faith," ſhe affirms, "doth *ever* bring forth good works[o]." "Good works," ſhe teaches, "are the *fruits* of faith, and follow after juſtification[p]." This is the import of the epithets "true," "quick," and "lively," which ſhe annexes to it, and the characteriſtic by which ſhe conſtantly diſtinguiſhes it from all counterfeits, that "it liveth and ſtirreth inwardly in the heart," "worketh by charity," "and is fruitful in bringing forth good works[q]." She ſubjoins, accordingly, to her definition of this faith; "whereof doth follow a loving heart to obey God's commandments[r]." She declares moſt expreſsly and repeatedly, that where "theſe fruits do not follow," men are *deſtitute* of the true faith; and that if they *pretend* to have it, they "deceive themſelves, mock God," and manifeſtly ſhow that they know not "what true faith meaneth[s]." "That faith," ſhe ſays, "which bringeth forth (without repentance) either evil works, or no good works, is *not* a right, pure, and lively faith, but a dead, deviliſh, counterfeit, and feigned faith, as St. Paul and St. James call it[t]." Nay, "it is not," ſhe ſays, "properly *called* faith[v];" and that forafmuch as it is thus "dead, it *is not now faith*, as a dead man is not a man[w]." Accordingly, after her definition of juſtifying faith, ſhe adds; "This true Chriſtian faith no man hath, who in his outward profeſſion . . . ſeemeth to be a Chriſtian man, and yet in his living and deeds ſhoweth the contrary[x]." And again, "If we do not ſhow ourſelves

(n) Hom. on faith, p. 23. (o) Ibid. p. 26. (p) Art. 12. (q) Hom. on faith, p. 20, and paſſim. (r) Hom. on Salva. p. 18. (s) Hom. on faith, p. 21, 26. (t) Hom. on Salva. p. 18. (v) Above, p. 192. (w) Above, p. 193. (x) Hom. on Salva. p. 18.

faithful in our converſation, the faith which we pretend to have is but a *feigned* faith [y]." "Deceive not yourſelves therefore thinking that you have faith in God, . . . when you live in ſin; for then your ungodly and ſinful life declareth the contrary, whatſoever you ſay or think [z]."

Nor is this mode of ſpeaking peculiar to our Articles and Homilies, but is the common language of our Reformers and the authorities they reſpected, on all occaſions.—— Archbiſhop Cranmer, ſpeaking of juſtifying faith, ſays, it "cannot but produce love and obedience [a]." Nowell's Catechiſm, treating on this faith, ſays, "it *always* has joined with it, a diſpoſition to obedience [b]." The Biſhops and Martyrs in priſon, having deſcribed the ſame faith, ſay, "where through as the mind is illuminated, ſo the heart is ſuppled to ſubmit itſelf to God unfeignedly; and ſo ſhoweth forth an inherent righteouſneſs;" and that although this righteouſneſs is to be diſtinguiſhed "in the article of juſtification, from the righteouſneſs which God endueth us withal juſtifying us," yet that "*inſeparably* they go together [c]." "Our church," the learned Biſhop of Lincoln accordingly ſays, "conſiders good works as eſſential to the character of a true Chriſtian, and, as the *neceſſary conſequence* of ſincere faith in Chriſt [d]."

Our church alſo aſſigns the *reaſons* why true faith is ever thus productive of obedience. Some of theſe are, becauſe "when we really receive Chriſt, we receive him ſuch as he offers himſelf to us; and that it is his office not only to deliver us from ſin and death, and reinſtate us in God's favour; but alſo to *reform and regenerate* us by the inſpiration and operation of his Spirit, and to reſtore us to that *love and practice of holineſs* which is called newneſs of life [e]:" becauſe

(y) Hom. on faith, p. 22. (z) Ibid. p. 26. (a) Above, p. 193. (b) Above, p. 194. (c) Ibid. (d) Elements, Vol. ii. p. 269. (e) Nowell's Cat. p. 112; and Hom. on Reſurrection, p. 277.

that as true believers "know Chriſt to be the only Saviour of the world, ſo they know alſo that wicked men ſhall not enjoy the kingdom of God [f]:" and becauſe, on believing, they become united to Chriſt as the branches are to the vine, and through the continued exerciſe of faith, derive from him ſtrength and nouriſhment, and whatever is requiſite for the ſupport of the ſpiritual life [g]. Hence ſhe concludes, that, in the nature of things, it is impoſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe; that the principles of the Goſpel really embraced muſt be operative [h]; that, as St. John argues, "being born of God they cannot," in the ordinary courſe of their behaviour, "commit ſin;" but that "his ſeed," the divine principle implanted in regeneration, "remaineth in them," and diſpoſeth them to reliſh and purſue whatever is excellent [i].——"Præterea," ſays the Augſburgh Confeſſion, "docent noſtri, quòd neceſſe ſit bona opera facere, non ut confidamus per ea gratiam mereri, ſed propter voluntatem Dei. Tantùm fide apprehenditur remiſſio peccatorum ac gratia. Et quia per fidem accipitur Spiritus ſanctus, jam corda renovantur, et induunt novos affectus, ut parere bona opera poſſint. Sic enim ait Ambroſius: Fides bonæ voluntatis, et juſtæ actionis genetrix eſt [z]."

In ſhort then, our church teaches moſt undeniably, "that *good works* do ſpring out NECESSARILY of a *true and lively faith* [k];" that "good living CANNOT BE SEPARATED from true faith;" that "as the light cannot be hid, but will ſhow forth itſelf at one place or other, ſo a *true faith cannot* be kept ſecret, but will ſhow itſelf by good works;" and that "as the living body of a man ever exerciſeth ſuch things as belong to a natural and living body, even ſo the ſoul that hath a lively faith in it, will be doing always ſome good

(f) Hom. on Salva. p. 18. (g) See above, p. 195; and Hom. on Good Works, p. 27. (h) Hom. on Salva. p. 18. (i) See Hom. on faith, p. 24—26. (z) Art. 20. (k) Art. 12. (l) Hom. on faith, p. 22.

work, which shall declare that it is living, and will not be unoccupied [m]."

In defiance however of all this, a writer, professing the greatest candour and fairness, and whose knowledge on the subject is represented as nearly unequalled, would persuade the world that to represent true faith "as necessarily productive of good works," is certainly *not* the doctrine of "the Church of England [n]!!!" To effect this purpose, and at the same time to show the absurdity and danger of such a doctrine, Mr. Daubeny has laboured in three separate Works, addressed respectively to three eminent modern characters [o]. Other Writers, filling the high office of Critics, and professed guardians of our Zion, have applauded Mr. D.'s labours, and have themselves denominated this notion a "novelty!" "an error undoubtedly," "thechild of Enthusiasm [p]," &c. &c.

To say, after a perusal of all he advances, what Mr. Daubeny's sentiments on this point are, would perhaps exceed the skill of man. A few of his remarks shall however be adduced to justify what has been said.

Thus then, "those persons," he says, "who affirm that 'where *true faith* is, there will be repentance, obedience, and holiness of life;' . . . have always appeared to him to confound, rather than to explain, the Christian doctrine [q]." To affirm this, Mr. D. conceives, "is in other words to say, that when the foundation is well laid, it will of itself raise the superstructure; or, to make use of another Scripture allusion, where the root of the tree is planted in Christ, Christian fruit will be the consequent produce of the branches. But in this case (he adds) facts are against us [r]."

(m) Ibid. p. 21. (n) See Mr. Daubeny's Letter to Mrs More, p. 39—41; his Appendix, 582, and below, p. 277, 278. (o) Mr. Wilberforce, Sir R. Hill, and Mrs. More. (p) See the Antijacobin Review for October, 1799, p. 195; and for November, p. 255. (q) Guide, p. 291. (r) Ibid. p. 293.

Again, the remark of Mr. Wilberforce, "that *faith*, where *genuine*, always supposes repentance, abhorrence of sin, &c." Mr. D. affirms, "is calculated to lead into error [s]." In like manner when it is remarked, "that *true faith* is in scripture regarded as the radical principle of holiness; and that if the root exist, the proper fruits will be brought forth;" Mr. D., admitting the premises, observes, "we feel ourselves called upon to deny the conclusion [t]."

Accordingly, after saying Mr. W. has described "Faith as the first radical grace of the Holy Spirit, which takes place in the heart of a sinner; and which brings with it pardon, reconciliation, and repentance; and never can exist without producing the radical fruits of holiness;" this Mr. D. adds to Mrs. More "is to say, in your words that there is an indivisible union between the Doctrines and Duties of Christianity; or that the latter grow out of the former, as the natural and necessary productions of such a *living root*. But, Madam," he subjoins, "this is not the language either of the Scripture, or of the Church of England [v]." To the same effect, "Faith," Mr. D. says, "may be ALIVE to no saving purpose [w]." . . . "The doctrine which represents the fruits of holiness as the *necessary produce* of *the Christian faith*, . . . is nearly related to that of faith without works, and is incompatible with the grand œconomy of man's salvation [x]." "Faith, which you compare to a *living root*, may LIVE without being productive. In this light St. James represents it [y]!"——The British Critic accordingly represents him, as combating "the notion that a *right faith* must of necessity produce good works [m]."

It is beyond all question then from hence, that the Faith which Mr. Daubeny denies to be necessarily productive, is not the "counterfeit, feigned, dead, devilish faith," of which

---

(s) Guide, p. 310. (t) Ibid. p. 300. (v) Letter to Mrs. More, p. 38. (w) Appendix, p. 586. (x) Ibid. p. 587. (y) Letter, p. 49. (m) December, 1800, p. 587.

our church ſpeaks, and which ſhe ſays "is not properly called faith," and "is *not faith*;" but the "*right*," "*true*," "*genuine*," "*living*," "*Chriſtian faith*;" faith conſidered "as the *firſt radical grace of the Holy Spirit*;" faith, as further explained by himſelf, as it is "the good work which the grace of God [z]" effects; as it implies "a firm belief in Chriſt [a]," "a reliance on the promiſes of God through Chriſt [b];" faith in ſhort, of the *very kind*, and diſtinguiſhed by the *very epithets*, with that which the church maintains *is neceſſarily* productive. His diſcordancy with her muſt therefore appear undeniable.

Unfortunately however for the credit of "the firſt Writers of the age," on other occaſions, Mr. D. maintains the directly oppoſite propoſition. "I have," he ſays, "again and again avowed, that *true lively Chriſtian faith muſt produce good works*; for if it *did not*, it would not be entitled to that diſtinction. The epithets *true* and *lively* added to faith, appear deſigned to diſtinguiſh it from that *falſe and dead* faith, of which St. James ſpeaks [c]!" And again, "If faith," he ſays, be taken for that honeſt *vital principle*, for which, in the Chriſtian ſenſe, it ought to be taken, it *muſt, of courſe*, produce thoſe fruits which are here deſcribed; it would not be *true faith* if it did not [d]!" This Mr. D. is the preciſe propoſition of thoſe you undertake to correct; and wherefore then all your toil?

But "by faith," it is added, "is here meant, faith in the *concrete*; in other words, faith with all the neceſſary ingredients of which it muſt be compoſed, to characterize its genuine quality [e]." That is, faith compoſed of the neceſſary ingredients of faith! Did Mr. D. ever hear of true faith compoſed of any other ingredients? But what are we to underſtand by faith in the *concrete?* Why, "faith including both belief and practice [f];" "faith as made perfect by

(z) Ibid. p. 52. (a) Guide, p. 292. (b) Appendix, p. 163. (c) Ibid. p. 166. (d) Ibid. p. 162. (e) Ibid. (f) Above, p. 191.

works [g];" "faith as comprehenſive of all Chriſtian duties [h]." And then the doctrine of our church is, that faith when conſidered as COMPREHENSIVE of good works, is *neceſſarily productive* of thoſe works!!

But perhaps Mr. D.'s admiring Reviewers can give us a more conſiſtent interpretation of his notions. No alas! They can only maintain his agreement with the church, by ſaying, that he "ſpoke of faith only as an abſtract propoſition, *undiſtinguiſhed by any characteriſtical epithet* to determine its peculiar quality [i]:" the very contrary to what has been proved to be the fact.

Theſe zealous Defenders of our church can however, of courſe, clearly ſhow their *own* coincidence with her. And this is thus effected: "Our poſition," they ſay, "is, that 'faith is not neceſſarily productive of good works:' and that of the Homily is, that 'there is one faith which bringeth forth no good works, but is idle, barren, and unfruitful.' Between theſe two, whatever difference there may ſometimes ſeem to be in ſound, we contend there is none in ſenſe. For to ſay that faith, under certain circumſtances, is unfruitful, is, as it appears to our underſtandings, tantamount to ſaying, that faith is not neceſſarily productive; ſince if it were neceſſarily productive, it muſt be always productive [k]."

But that which is *called* faith of which the Homily affirms this, it ſays expreſsly, is only a "*feigned* faith," and is "*not* faith;" whereas theſe Gentlemen, as followers of Mr. Daubeny, or indeed as having any meaning, are ſpeaking of *true Chriſtian faith*. The argument therefore is, becauſe that which is NOT faith is not neceſſarily productive, therefore that which IS faith is not neceſſarily productive! And Mrs. More is almoſt charged with ſupercilious contempt

---

(g) Guide, p. 302. (h) Ibid. p. 291. (i) See Antijac. Review for March, 1800, p. 331. (k) Ibid.

for not publicly retracting her opinion[l] in consequence of this discovery!

But to add a few words in vindication of our doctrine. Our Lord affirms, that "Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit;" and that "A good tree *cannot* bring forth evil fruit[m]." It does not however follow, that all good trees are *alike* good; that there may not be great *variety* both in the *quantity* and *quality* of the fruit of good trees; that the same trees are *equally* fruitful in all situations, in all seasons, and under every sort of culture; that they have not need of constant nourishment from the earth, and of exposure to the common influences of heaven, in order to their fruitfulness; or, that both the trees themselves and their fruit may not be injured by storms and blights. But thus much is certainly intended; that, in the ordinary course of things, such trees cannot produce *bad fruit;* that however *small* the quantity, or however *poor* of its kind their produce may be, yet that still it will necessarily be of the *kind* with the tree, and different from that of a tree which is bad in nature; or, that if occasionally this produce is really rendered worthless, that it cannot then be considered as the *natural* fruit of the tree, but as this fruit counteracted and spoiled by some opposite influence.

And just so it is with true believers. They have not all obtained the same *degree* of "like precious faith:" They are not all *alike* fruitful: The same Christians are not equally fruitful at all seasons and under all circumstances: They have all need of continuation in the Christian soil; of the means of Christianity; the refreshing showers of Divine Grace, and the fructifying beams of the Sun of righteousness, in order both to the life of their faith, and their fruitfulness in good works: The best of them are liable to suffer either in their principles or behaviour from the blights and storms of temptation, and the counteraction of their old

(l) See Antijac. Review for October, 1799, p. 195; and for November, 1799, p. 255. (m) Mat. vi. 17, 18.

nature: Yet can they never, upon the whole and in the general courſe of their lives, be ſo deſtitute of fruit as not widely to differ from all others: When there is the leaſt of this difference obſervable in their external conduct, it is always great in reſpect to the principle by which they are actuated.

When therefore Mr. Daubeny ſays, "The poſition, that faith muſt neceſſarily produce good works, leaves no middle character between the downright infidel and the perfect Chriſtian[n];" he might as well ſay, that a tree if good in nature, will produce an equal quantity of equally perfect fruit, whatever may be its age, ſtrength, ſize, or ſituation. When he ſuppoſes that this poſition renders the uſe of the means of grace unneceſſary[o]; he might as well ſuppoſe that a tree is expected to live, and grow, and produce fruit, when it is not continued in the earth, and expoſed to the influence of the air, and rain, and ſun. When he maintains, "that faith and practice are ſeparable things," or that *true faith* may exiſt, without producing any good works[p]; he might as well maintain that a tree is good which is good for nothing: he maintains, as Biſhop Horſley expreſſes it, "a groſs miſtake, or rather a manifeſt contradiction." "The direct contrary," his Lordſhip affirms, "is the truth;" and that "the practice of religion will always thrive, in proportion as its doctrines are generally underſtood and firmly received[q]." And when it is maintained that this notion leads to "Antinomianiſm[r]," the charge muſt be retorted: for, on the ſuppoſition we are oppoſing, formaliſts, enthuſiaſts, and perſons of the worſt moral characters may fancy that they have faith, and are intereſted in the bleſſings annexed to it; whereas on our ſyſtem no perſon is warranted to conſider himſelf a true believer, and conſequently in the favour of God, who has not a ſuitable conduct. For hence,

---

(n) Letter, p. 45. (o) Ibid. p. 29—35; Guide, 291, &c. (p) See above, p. 277, &c. (q) Charge, p. 8. (r) See Mr. Daubeny's Appendix, p. 587; and the Review of the Controverſy in the Antijacobin, as above.

Our church alſo further enforces the neceſſity of good works, by conſidering them as the only ſatisfactory *Evidences* of faith and a juſtified ſtate.——If true faith is conſidered as thus neceſſarily productive, none, it is manifeſt, are warranted to ſuppoſe themſelves poſſeſſed of it, but in proportion as they experience its fruits and effects. Accordingly, "By them," i. e. good works, our church ſays, "a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree diſcerned by the fruit[s]." Her common characteriſtic of thoſe who are "juſtified" alſo is, that "they are made like the image of God's only begotten Son Jeſus Chriſt;" and that, "they walk religiouſly in good works[t]." She exhorts us therefore, like our Saviour and his Apoſtles, to eſtimate the tree "by the fruit[v];" to "examine and try ourſelves diligently, to know whether we have the true lively faith in our hearts, or not, which we ſhall know by the fruits thereof[w];" to "look upon our works, and ſo judge of our faith what it is[x]." Our "deeds and works," ſhe ſays, "muſt be an open teſtimonial of our faith;" "declarations and teſtimonies of our juſtification;" and muſt certify it to our own conſciences, and to other men[y]. Otherwiſe, whatever we may pretend, ſhe maintains moſt peremptorily, and proves from St. John, that "we lack the true Chriſtian faith," and remain under God's diſpleaſure, and that if we perſevere in this ſtate our hypocritical profeſſion will increaſe our final condemnation[z].

And can the neceſſity of virtue be more ſtrongly inculcated than by thus making Sanctification the neceſſary Evidence of Juſtification? Can the preſumptuous hopes of the careleſs or enthuſiaſtic profeſſor be more effectually ſup-

---

(s) Art. 12. (t) Art. 17. (v) Homily on faith, p. 26; on Almſdeeds, p. 247; for Whitſunday, p. 292. (w) Homily on faith, p. 23. (x) Ibid. p. 26. (y) Ibid; and Homily on Faſting, p. 174. (z) Homily on faith, p. 26; on Salvation, p. 18; on the Reſurrection, p. 280.

preſſed, than by only allowing men to conſider themſelves really Chriſtians in proportion as they are actuated by Chriſtian principles, and exhibit a Chriſtian conduct?

And that what the church conſiders as conſtituting this evidence, and as eſſential in order to diſtinguiſh men true believers, is a morality very ſuperior to any thing which our opponents make neceſſary to this end, is pretty clear from her very ſuperior notions reſpecting the Rule of morals [a]. That conduct cannot exclude men from the privileges of any ſociety, which is tolerated by the laws of the ſociety; and we have ſeen how little is implied in *their* notion of a moral man [b]. The ſame matter is clear from the whole tenour of her language. To what has already appeared a ſingle quotation ſhall be added.

Speaking then expreſsly on the point, "A man," ſhe ſays, "may ſoon deceive himſelf, and think that he by faith knoweth God, loveth him, feareth him, and belongeth to him, when in very deed he doth nothing leſs. For the trial of all theſe things is a very Godly and Chriſtian life. He that feeleth his heart ſet to ſeek God's honour, and ſtudieth to know the will and commandments of God, and to frame himſelf thereunto, and leadeth not his life after the deſire of his own fleſh, to ſerve the Devil by ſin; but *ſetteth his mind to ſerve God for his own ſake*, and for his ſake alſo to love his neighbours, whether they be friends or adverſaries, doing good to every man, as opportunity ſerveth, and willingly hurting no man: Such a man may well rejoice in God, perceiving *by the trade of his life*, that he unfeignedly hath the right knowledge of God, a lively faith, a ſtedfaſt hope, a true and unfeigned love and fear of God [c]." On the other hand, ſhe labours to prove from the Scriptures, that we neither know God, love him, truſt in him, nor belong to him, if we keep not his commandments, love not our brethren, and do not righteouſneſs [d].

(a) See above, p. 221—272. (b) Above, p. 272. (c) Hom. on faith, p. 25. (d) Ibid. p. 24; and on Charity, p. 38.

is not this requiring far more in order to constitute a genuine Christian, than they do, who treat *all* as real Christians who have been educated in a Christian country, except professed Infidels, and some notorious offenders against the peace of society? The lowest construction which can fairly be put upon the above passage, and others which have been quoted or referred to, is, that no man ought to consider himself in a justified state who is not free from the allowed indulgence of any *one known sin*; who does not pay an habitual regard to *every known duty*; and whose *leading object*, the "trade of whose life," as the Homily expresses it, is not to promote the honour of God and the happiness of men.

In this manner then, and to this extent, does our church insist upon Good Works as the only satisfactory *Evidence* of true faith and a justified state; and thus are they as firmly secured as when they are considered as co-efficient conditions with faith in justification.

There is however no foundation for the charge, that this is defining faith by its *effects* [c]. A direct definition of it has been given [d]. And this recourse to its effects is not to ascertain *what* faith is, but *where* it is. And, as a learned Writer has well shown, this is an expedient we constantly resort to in regard to "all active principles [e]."

Other grounds upon which our church enforces the necessity of holiness, and stimulates endeavours after the greatest possible eminency in it, are, that it is commanded of God [f]; that a grand end of the Christian dispensation is our restoration to it [g]; that good works which are the fruits of

(c) See Bishop Cleaver's Note on Nowel's Cat. p. 49. (d) Above, p. 188. (e) See Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 353. (f) Hom. on Salva. p. 13; on Falling, p. 174; on Works, p. 35. (g) Hom. on Nativity, p. 259; on the Passion, p. 262—4; on the Resurrection, p. 276—9.

faith are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ [h]; and, that we are bound to obey his Will, and surrender ourselves to his good pleasure, by the most immense obligations of gratitude [i].

On these points she insists so strongly, and under so many forms, as would render the denial of our position utterly absurd. We need not therefore here be detained by adducing further particular proofs——And what rich, what various, what potent springs of virtuous action are here laid open? Is it a slight obligation which results from the Command of the Creator to his Creature? Can they, with any degree of justice, be said to leave out of their religion the necessity of holiness, who consider their restoration to it *one* of two *grand ends* for which the whole scheme of their redemption was undertaken? Is it depreciating the dignity of the very best works that men in our circumstances can perform, to represent them as "pleasing and acceptable" to that All-perfect Being to whom we are so infinitely indebted, and whom the brightest Seraphim esteem it their delight to obey? And what motives *can* secure our allegiance to heaven, if these amazing obligations of gratitude do not? This last principle is rightly urged in all its bearings, and considered as wonderfully efficacious; as adapted to move us "if we be not desperate persons, and our hearts harder than stones [k]."

But what is especially dwelt upon, and considered as giving the greatest possible prevalency to this motive, is, the *method* of our redemption. The crucifixion of God's only and well-beloved Son, the exaction of *such sufferings* of *such a Being*, as the only acceptable atonement for the sin of man, our church conceives to be most awfully expressive of the evil nature and malignant consequences of sin, and of God's hatred of it; and, of course, as furnishing a most urgent mo-

(h) Art. 12. (i) Hom. on Salva. p. 19. (k) Ibid.

tive to abhor and ſhun it. "If," ſhe ſays, "God hateth ſin ſo much that he would allow neither Man nor Angel for the redemption thereof, but only the death of his Only and Well-beloved Son; who will not ſtand in fear thereof; who will not hate ſin in his heart!?" And, having deſcribed the Saviour's laſt agony, and the wonderful phænomena of nature which accompanied it, "Canſt thou," ſhe ſays, "O ſinful man think of this and not tremble within thyſelf? Shall man ſhew himſelf to be more hard hearted than ſtones, to have leſs compaſſion than dead bodies [m]?"

And after mentioning, as plain tokens of God's abhorrence of ſin, the deſtruction of the old world, that of Sodom and Gomorrah, and many other awful events of this nature, "This one example which we have in hand," ſhe ſays, "is of more force, and ought more to move us then all the reſt [n]."——On the other hand, our church repreſents the grace, mercy, and love diſplayed in this tranſaction, as calling upon us in the moſt irreſiſtible language to *live unto him, who hath died for us*. This wonderful love and mercy, the circumſtances under which they were exerciſed, and the characters who were the objects of them, ſhe largely expatiates upon; and concludes, that the proper contemplation of all this, muſt melt every heart, and engage every generous affection [o]. In a word, on this point the ſtrong language of Young only expreſſes her feelings:

"And, groaning Calvary, of thee! there ſhine
The nobleſt truths; there ſtrongeſt motives ſting;
There ſacred violence aſſaults the ſoul;
There nothing but compulſion is forborn.
Can love allure us, or can terror awe?
He weeps!—the falling drop puts out the Sun;
He ſighs!—the ſigh earth's deep foundation ſhakes [p]."

(l) Hom. on Paſſion, p. 261; and Hom. on Repentance, p. 349.
(m) Hom. on Paſſion, p. 269. (n) Ibid. p. 270. (o) Ibid. p. 271.
p) Night Thoughts, N. 4. p. 88.

And who, it may well be inquired, can really believe, and ſeriouſly contemplate, this tranſaction, and yet think ſin a trifle? Who, that poſſeſſes one generous feeling, can behold this love, and not burn with love in return? Who, that poſſeſſes a capability of virtue, muſt not hence be conſtrained to every action that may either honour God or benefit man [z]?

A further diſtinct ground on which holineſs is inculcated conſiſtently with our doctrine, is, that it is requiſite in order to *qualify us* for ſpiritual exerciſes here, and the enjoyments of heaven hereafter.

No enjoyments, it is certain, can render creatures happy, except thoſe for which they have a ſuitable capacity and taſte. But what taſte, what capacity, can unholy and impenitent ſinners have for the exerciſes of true religion, which conſiſts in knowing, loving, worſhipping, and reſembling the infinitely pure and holy God? Are not his ſovereign authority, his holy character, his righteous law, his humiliating doctrines, his ſpiritual ſervice, his faithful people, rather ſources of their uneaſineſs, and objects of their averſion? Their "unclean filthineſs," as the homily expreſſes the matter, "ſeparates and makes a diviſion betwixt them and their God, and hideth his face from them;" and their conſciouſneſs of this filthineſs makes them aſhamed to appear in his preſence, and diſpoſes them to hate him. They are therefore utterly unfit for God's ſervice, without taſte and

(z) "It is much diſputed," the honourable Mr. Boyle obſerves, "whether God could contrive to reconcile the expiation of ſin, without violating his juſtice, any other way, than by the paſſion and death of Chriſt; but whether he could or not, he hath choſen the *moſt obliging way*, the *manner* of our reſcue diſplaying the ſevereſt juſtice, and the higheſt mercy; the greateſt hatred of ſin, and the greateſt love to ſinners." Works epit. Vol. iii. p. 427.

reliſh for it, and incapable of finding any delight in it [q]. Such characters, accordingly, are prohibited by our church from partaking in her holy myſteries [r]; and reminded, that without a due preparation of heart, our addreſſes to God, are not only unacceptable, but abominable to him [s]. Knowing therefore, that the indulgence of ſin is thus incompatible with intercourſe with God; and believing, that in proportion to his degree of conformity to the Divine image will be his degree of preſent comfort, the true Chriſtian is careful to avoid ſin, and labours after the greateſt poſſible attainments in holineſs.

Still leſs qualified however are unholy and unſanctified perſons for that more perfect worſhip, that more exalted ſociety, and thoſe more purely ſpiritual employments, which conſtitute the felicities of heaven. Not only therefore are ſuch characters excluded from this happy place, by a poſitive appointment [t], but declared alſo to "be *meet* for no better purpoſe, than to be for ever condemned in hell [v]." And really, what delight would it afford *them* to have acceſs into God's glorious preſence, and to ſee the Lord Jeſus Chriſt as he is [w], who are wholly deſtitute of affection for him, and whoſe lives have been a courſe of rebellion againſt him? What reliſh could they have for the ſociety of angels, and of the ſpirits of juſt men made perfect, whoſe enjoyments here have been entirely of a ſenſual and worldly nature? With what ſatisfaction could they join in the new ſong before the throne, who have acquired no taſte for the exerciſes of thankſgiving and praiſe? The very circumſtances which conſtitute it heaven to the ſaints, would render it hell to the unſanctified and unholy. Were it poſſible therefore for un-

(q) See Hom. on Repentance, p. 349; Zechariah xi. 8; Amos iii. 3; John iii; Rom. viii. (r) Exhorta. at Commu.; and Hom. on Sac. p. 285. (s) Hom. on Common prayer, p. 230. (t) See Hom. on Repent. p. 349; and 1 Cor. vi. 9. (v) Hom. on falling from God, p. 51. (w) See 1 John iii. 2.

holy perſons to ſhow a *title* to the inheritance of the ſaints in light, they would be deſtitute of all *meetneſs* for it, they would be utterly incapable of enjoying it.

Hence then alſo appears the abſolute neceſſity of regeneration and holineſs. And hence, in the very firſt office of our church, we have this ſtrong declaration of the Saviour, not only that none *ſhall*, but that "none *can* enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghoſt [x]." Hence we ſee, that thoſe good works and holy diſpoſitions which are the fruits of faith, and of the Spirit, and evidences of juſtification, by which the Chriſtian glorifies his Saviour and profits his generation here, alſo qualify and capacitate him for his future inheritance. And hence he finds another powerful incentive to cultivate and abound in them. For, to omit an almoſt infinity of other motives to this conduct, ariſing from conſiderations of intereſt, ſafety, comfort, propriety, &c.,

The laſt ground, I ſhall mention, on which the Advocates for juſtification by faith alone enforce good works, is, that our *eternal ſtate of felicity* in heaven will be *proportioned* to our *degree of fruitfulneſs* in theſe works.——It has indeed been recently objected againſt us, that we "do not know whether there be different degrees of glory in a future ſtate [y]." But however certain Individuals may have expreſſed themſelves, a ſlight degree of knowledge on the ſubject would have reſtrained theſe Critics from repreſenting this ſentiment as common to us. And how the doctrine of a gradation of future bleſſedneſs "militates againſt our notions of election," and why it is "not preached by us [z]" on this account, it will require no ordinary ingenuity to ſhow. Juſt as plauſibly may it be argued from the differences of men's minds or bodies that God has not *created* them. Hath not

(x) Bap. Service. (y) See Antijac. Rev. for April, 1799, p. 370.
(z) Ibid.

the Potter power over the clay, of the ſame lump, to make one veſſel unto honour, and another unto diſhonour [a]? Some for nobler, and others for meaner purpoſes? However the nature and characters of men may ſavour of the ſame corrupt maſs before they become true Chriſtians, nobody ſuppoſes that they continue the ſame characters afterwards. Always is it underſtood, that on their really becoming the diſciples of Jeſus, they are taken under his divine diſcipline, ſanctified by his Holy Spirit, and prepared for whatever ſtation in his kingdom they are deſigned. All true Chriſtians are repreſented as members conſtituting one body, of which Chriſt is the head. They muſt therefore occupy different places, and poſſeſs different capacities. And "God," the Apoſtle ſays, "hath ſet the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleaſed him [b]."

The inheritance of the Saints in light will, doubtleſs, conſiſt of different degrees of bleſſedneſs; and theſe, it may alſo be ſafely concluded, will exactly correſpond with their different characters and attainments here. This ſeems naturally to follow from the conſideration that good works will in any ſenſe be rewarded, a doctrine which none, who admit the authority of ſcripture, can queſtion. The common phraſe of ſcripture on the ſubject, that we ſhall be judged, rewarded, and receive, "every one *according* to our works [c]," in ſtrictneſs, implies it. In regard to different degrees of puniſhment, many paſſages are expreſs [d]; and ſome appear nearly ſo reſpecting the reward [e]. It is a doctrine alſo highly conſonant to our reaſon and judgment of fitneſs. For, "can it be," as the excellent Dr. Watts inquires, "that the great 'judge who cometh, and his reward with him, to render to every one according to his works,' will make no diſtinction between Moſes and Samſon, between St. Paul

(a) Rom. ix. 21. (b) 1 Cor. xii. 12, &c. (c) Mat. xvi. 27; 2 Cor. v. 10; Revela. xx. 13. (d) Luke xii. 47; Mat. xi. 20—24. (e) See 2 Cor. ix. 6; Mat. x. 41, 42; Luke xix. 12—19; 1 Cor. xv. 41, 42.

and the Thief on the Croſs, between the aged Martyr and the dying Infant[f]?" Accordingly, although for the moſt part, like her ſacred model, our church contents herſelf with propoſing heaven in general as the object of our purſuit; yet does ſhe by no means omit the view of it under conſideration, but prays that God's "faithful people plenteouſly bringing forth the fruit of good works, may of him be plenteouſly rewarded, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord[g]."

Nor do the Divines whoſe doctrines I am vindicating vary from her on the point. "In conſequence of our juſtification," ſays Jonathan Edwards, "our good deeds become rewardable with ſpiritual and eternal rewards[h]." "Our relation to Chriſt adds a poſitive value and dignity to our good works in God's ſight." "They receive an exceeding value in the ſight of God, by virtue of God's beholding us as in Chriſt, and as it were members of one ſo infinitely worthy in his eyes[i]." So reſpecting the other particular. "God," he ſays, "hath been pleaſed to fix the *degree* of each one's capacity and ſo of glory, by the proportion of the ſaints' grace and fruitfulneſs here: He gives higher degrees of glory, in reward for higher degrees of holineſs and good works[k]."

"Many ſcriptures," Dr. Doddridge adds, "declare expreſsly that God at the great day will 'render to every man according to his works,' and intimate that there ſhall be an *exact correſpondence* between every man's character and the reward which, through the riches of divine grace, ſhall then be beſtowed[l]." So, ſpeaking of thoſe who are juſtified by faith, "Their ſubſequent good works," Mr. Scott obſerves, "conſtitute the *meaſure* by which their gracious recompenſe is aſcertained[m]." Their joys, when their earthly tabernacle

(f) See his Sermons, Vol. i. S. 12. p. 273. (g) Collect 25 after Trinity; and Hom. p. 60, 242, 245. (h) Diſcourſe on Juſtification, p. 89. (i) Ibid. p. 93. (k) Ibid. p. 101. (l) Expoſitor, Mat. xx. Note. (m) Eſſays, p. 323.

is taken down, "are *proportioned* to the degree of their grace and fruitfulneſs on earth [n]."

And ſuch are our uſual ſentiments [z]. Yet, as Mr. Edwards has largely ſhown [o], all this is perfectly conſiſtent with being accounted righteous before God only for the merit of Chriſt, by faith. Becauſe, it is not *antecedent* to our juſtification, but wholly in *conſequence* of it, and of our intereſt in, and relation to Chriſt, that our works are thus accepted and rewarded. And becauſe, it is plain how all the Saints, as members of Chriſt's myſtical body, may partake of his benefits, and be *perfectly* happy, and yet poſſeſs *different degrees* of happineſs, according to their different places and capacities.

But, if this is the caſe, if the good works of believers will be rewarded with ſuch immenſe bleſſings; if their attainments in virtue here conſtitute the capacity for, and will form the meaſure of, their eternal inheritance; if the more they now partake of the ſpirit and nature of Chriſt Jeſus their head, the nearer will be their approaches to him in his kingdom of glory; ſurely they cannot want a motive to the greateſt poſſible efforts after holineſs; ſurely on this ground alſo it becomes them to be "ſtedfaſt, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, foraſmuch as they know that their labour is not in vain in the Lord [p]."

Theſe then, among others, are the grounds upon which our church and thoſe who adhere to her notions of juſtification, inculcate Chriſtian morality upon ſuch as ſuppoſe themſelves *believers*. They conſider holy diſpoſitions and good works, as the *natural fruit* and *neceſſary effect* of that faith which juſtifies; as the only *ſatisfactory evidence* of a juſtified ſtate; as *commanded of God*, and *pleaſing* and *acceptable* to him in Chriſt; as what we are bound unto by the

(n) Eſſays, p. 318. (z) See alſo Mr. Scott's Sermons, p. 205, 208; Scripture Characters, N. T. Vol. i. p. 457—460; &c.
(o) Diſcourſe on Juſtification, p. 88—102. (p) 1 Cor. xv. 58.

moſt preſſing obligations of *gratitude*; as abſolutely requiſite in order to our *meetneſs* for God's ſervice and heaven; and, as what will fix the *degree* of our bleſſedneſs in eternity.

"It is," therefore, as the judicious Hooker in reply to the Papiſts on the ſubject obſerves, "a childiſh cavil, wherewith, in the matter of juſtification, our adverſaries do ſo greatly pleaſe themſelves, exclaiming, that we tread all Chriſtian virtues under our feet, and require nothing in Chriſtians but faith; becauſe we teach that faith alone juſtifieth. Whereas, by this ſpeech, we never meant to exclude either hope or charity, from being always joined as *inſeparable* mates with faith in the man that is juſtified; or works from being added as neceſſary duties, required at the hands of every juſtified man: but to ſhow that faith is the only hand that putteth on Chriſt unto juſtification [q]; &c."

"That man is juſtified by faith, without the works of the law," Biſhop Horſley to the ſame effect remarks, "was the uniform doctrine of the firſt Reformers. . . And no one who hath the leaſt acquaintance with their writings will impute to them the abſurd opinion, that any man leading an impenitent and wicked life, will finally, upon the mere pretence of faith, and faith connected with an impenitent life muſt always be a mere pretence, obtain admiſſion into heaven [r]."——Hence alſo the character of a "believing Chriſtian," as drawn by Lord Bacon, is intelligible and conſiſtent: "He knoweth he ſhall not be ſaved *by*, nor *for* his good works, yet he doth all the good works he can [s]."

But, as hath been already obſerved, on whatever grounds the church can enforce morality conſiſtently with this doctrine of juſtification, we can conſiſtently imitate her. And that on all proper occaſions we do thus enforce it, our opponents will not readily diſprove. The motives which have juſt been ſpecified are urged with equal conſtancy and

(q) See his Diſcourſe on Juſtification, p. 31. (r) Ch. p. 26.
(s) Works, Vol. iv. p. 505.

equal force by the ſubjects of this apology [z], as in the writings of our church. However explicit we are, and think it of importance to be, in ſhowing that good works are not the *means* through which we become united to the Saviour and obtain juſtification; our uniform doctrine is, that all "whom God did foreknow, he alſo did predeſtinate to be *conformed to the image of his Son* [s]," and to "walk religiouſly in good works [t]:" that our *ſanctification* is *equally as eſſential* in order to our happineſs, both here and hereafter, as our juſtification, and *equally provided for* in the ſcheme of redemption: that from the very nature of true faith, and of the Divine principle implanted in regeneration, love, holineſs, victory over the world, &c. will naturally and neceſſarily reſult: that nothing except an habitual renunciation of evil, and purſuit of that which is good; "a patient continuance in well doing;" "a bringing forth fruit with patience;" is a ſatisfactory evidence of a ſtate of ſalvation; nay, that all pretenſions to ſuch a ſtate without this evidence is the higheſt preſumption, and the groſſeſt abſurdity: and in ſhort, that it is the Chriſtian's bounden duty, his higheſt intereſt, his firmeſt ſecurity, and will conſtitute his daily pleaſure, to love, cheriſh, cultivate, and purſue every ſpecies, and every poſſible degree of holineſs, for all the reaſons, and in conſideration of all the motives which have been enumerated.

And is THIS "*ſetting up faith in oppoſition to a good life* [v]?" Is *this* teaching "ſomething *very* AVERSE *to morality* [w]," and meriting the very heavy charges with which we are loaded, on the ſubject? Is *this*, as Mr. Clapham affirms of thoſe with whom we are claſſed, not making "the *regulation of the moral temper*, and the extinction of the malignant paſſions,

(z) See the Writings of thoſe of them who have been mentioned, paſſim; Section 3 below; Skeletons of Sermons, by Mr. Simeon; the Sermons of Mr. Adam, and of Mr. Walker; &c. &c. (s) Rom. viii. 29, 30. (t) Article 17. (v) See above, p. 268. (w) Above, p. 268.

an *essential* or even a *subordinate* part of our system[x]?" Is *this*, as Mr. Haggitt pourtrays us, holding doctrines "not only *most shocking to our moral feelings*, but *utterly subversive of the first principles of civilized society*;" doctrines, "the obvious effect" of which "is, to *cut asunder the bonds of all moral obligation*[m]?" Is *this*, as Mr. Daubeny has the courage to maintain is the case, "describing the *observance of the moral precepts* of the gospel, as 'vain wisdom and false philosophy'[y]?" Is *this*, as he also represents us, being "perfectly agreed in *decrying good works*[z]?" Is it not, on the contrary, making these works as necessary and as important, in their place, as faith is; yea, in many respects, *superior* to it, as the fruit is superior to the tree, and the end to the means? Only, it is not substituting the fruit in the place of the tree. It is not assigning our good works that place in the scheme of salvation which the scripture has not assigned them.

But are there, can there be, any more powerful motives to obedience, than those which have been mentioned? What principles *can* bind the consciences, interest the feelings, and influence the conduct of Christ's professed Disciples, if considerations like these do not? Have our opponents any more exalted or more efficacious incentives to virtue?

They do, it is admitted, in some respects out-bid us. They speak of works as "recommending men to the mercy of God, and rendering them worthy of the mediation of the Saviour;" and promise them heaven itself as the reward of their merits and the price of their doings, in a sense that we dare not[a]. They can, with Dr. Paley, enforce morality on principles more purely *selfish*, and maintain that "We can be obliged to nothing, neither to practice virtue, obey the Will of God, or any thing else, but what we ourselves are to

(x) Sermon at Boroughbridge, p. 21. (m) Visitation Sermon, Preface, p. 15. (y) Guide, p. 297. (z) Appendix, p. 339.
(a) See above, p. 140, 210—215, and Mr. Fellowes' Anticalvinist.

gain or *loſe* ſomething by [b]; and that therefore private happineſs," that is, *ſelfiſhneſs*, "is our motive [c]" to all virtue. But is that indeed the higheſt ſpecies of virtue which flows wholly from this ſource [z]? Is this the *only*, or the *principal* ground upon which the Goſpel inculcates obedience? Or, may it not rather be doubted whether the conduct which partakes of no higher principle is Chriſtian morality at all? And can there, in the eye of reaſon, be a greater abſurdity than to talk of creatures, circumſtanced as we are, "dead in treſpaſſes and ſins [d]," or in our beſt eſtate "unprofitable ſervants [e]," *meriting* any thing at the hands of our Maker; and eſpecially of our meriting an intereſt in Chriſt Jeſus, or eternal glory? It muſt however exceed the ingenuity of man to reconcile theſe notions with the doctrine of our church. But if this apparently high price, which is offered to men, for their good works, cannot be ſecured to them; if neither ſcripture, reaſon, nor the church, will warrant to them the payment of it, they may well be expected more abundantly to produce theſe works for conſiderations which are more certain, though leſs ſpecious.

And, in regard to every other motive our ſyſtem has moſt obviouſly the advantage. Their lower notions of human depravity [f], of the work of the Redeemer [g], and of the Rule of Duty [h], neceſſarily lower the motives to repentance, gratitude, charity, humility, and conſtant exertions after higher attainments in every branch of holineſs. Becauſe, only in proportion as the diſeaſe is thought ſerious, will men

(b) Moral and Political Philoſophy, p. 50. quarto. (c) Ibid. p. 51. (z) "Though," ſaith Biſhop Atterbury, "a good action doth not grow immediately worthleſs by being done with the proſpect of advantage, as ſome have ſtrangely imagined; yet it will be allowed, I ſuppoſe, that its being done, without the mixture of that end, or with as little of it as poſſible, recommends it ſo much the more, and raiſes the price of it." Sermon on Pſalm l. 14. (d) See Ephes. ii. 1; and above, p. 210—212.. (e) Luke, xvii. 10. (f) See above, Chap. 4. p. 129, &c. (g) Ibid. Chap. 6. p. 178, &c. (h) Ibid. Chap. 7. p. 221, &c.

be serious about the remedy [i]; they only who believe that much is forgiven them, will love much [k]; they who ascribe most to their own powers and merits, will least exclude boasting [l]; and they who have a reduced standard of duty, will see fewer imperfections to lament, and less reason continually "to forget the things which are behind, and to reach forth unto those which are before [m]." Their notions in regard to "a defective obedience" as all that is required; their ideas upon sincerity; the duties of the first table; and the other particulars respecting the rule of conduct, which have been specified, are, in fact, strongly *antinomian*, and so many express tolerations of deviation from the moral law of God [n].

Their slight manner of enforcing the necessity of a renovation of heart and principle [o] must also be exceeding unfriendly to a good conduct: for, who that expects a pure stream will not be careful to purify the fountain? Who would attempt to gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles [p]?

But what must have the worst effect of all, is, their not sufficiently distinguishing between real and merely nominal Christians; their not insisting upon a holy life as essential to a state of salvation; but too much treating all as entitled to the hopes of Christianity who are admitted within its external pale; whether or not, in any sober scriptural sense of the terms, they comply with their baptismal engagements [q]. In this manner the Jews of old rested in Externals and neglected the spirit and practical part of their religion, till they involved themselves in ruin. And hence, among ourselves, men are induced to think well of their state and character, and to hope for admission into heaven, who are not only destitute of the required disposition of heart, but guilty of many gross immoralities; yea, who live in the

(i) See Mat. ix. 12. (k) Luke, vii. 47. (l) Rom. iii. 27. (m) Phil. iii. 13. (n) See above, p. 228, &c. (o) Above, p. 114, &c.; 169, &c. (p) Mat. vii. 16. (q) See above, p. 114, &c.

open violation of every one of the ten commandments, except those, the known breach of which would banish them out of the Country, or make work for the Executioner.

Such is the strictness with which these champions for Morality enforce it upon those who are considered real Christians! So little do they require as the *evidence* of a state of salvation!

But in consequence of our larger demands in regard to this evidence, a far greater proportion of those who bear the Christian name, will class with the *Impenitent* and *Unbelieving*. It deserves therefore also to be enquired, which party holds forth the strongest motives to repentance and serious application to the Saviour; or whose moral sanctions are most powerful as they more especially respect characters of this description?

The church then, it has appeared, in strict conformity with the sacred scriptures, every where speaks of the penalty annexed to disobedience, and the punishment which awaits the finally impenitent, in the *strongest and most awful terms* imaginable[r]. She considers all persons who "live in sin," and contrary to their "high profession," as now lying under the Divine displeasure, and that there is no possible method of their escaping this most awful punishment, if they continue in their present course, if they do not "with hearty repentance and true faith," turn unto the Saviour. "Upon such presumptuous persons and wilful sinners," she says, "must needs remain the great vengeance of God[s]." "The filthiness of sin," she says again, "is such, that as long as we do abide in it, God cannot but detest and abhor us, neither can there be any hope, that we shall enter into the heavenly Jerusalem, except we be first made clean and purged from it. But this will never be, unless forsaking our former life, we do with

(r) Above, p. 141—148; Hom. on Repent. p. 351. (s) Hom. on Faith, p. 26.

our whole heart return unto the Lord our God, and with a full purpoſe of amendment of life, flee unto his mercy, taking ſure hold thereupon through faith in the blood of his Son Jeſus Chriſt [t]." And ſo far is ſhe from ſuppoſing that their having profeſſed Chriſt's religion, and eaten and drunken at his table, will furniſh ſuch characters with any uſeful excuſe, that this circumſtance, their abuſe of ſuch diſtinguiſhing privileges, ſhe maintains, will aggravate their condemnation [v].

And that on this head we follow her ſteps it will be unneceſſary to prove. This doctrine, added to our ſtrict requiſitions in reſpect to the evidences of a ſtate of ſalvation, is what our opponents brand us with, as conſtituting the gloomineſs and rigour of our ſyſtem. Hence it is that we are holden up to ridicule as "interlarding our diſcourſes with ſlices of hell and damnation [w];" as "brandiſhing with terror the menace of damnation [x];" as "dealing damnation round the land [y]." The crime imputed to us on this ſubject is, that we ſet bounds to God's mercy, unfit men for the pleaſures and duties of life, and drive them to deſpair [z]. And truly, we dare not trifle on the tremendous ſubject. Whatever may be the preciſe nature of the future puniſhment of the wicked, if words have any meaning, ſomething, we apprehend, inconceivably dreadful muſt be implied in ſuch repreſentations of it as thoſe juſt alluded to, with which the ſcripture abounds. Whatever of harſhneſs or difficulty the doctrine may preſent, becauſe it appears to us the certain doctrine of ſcripture, we dare not reject or mitigate it.

And as to charity towards our fellow-creatures, they ſurely, we conceive, have the juſteſt claim to it, who uſe every endeavour to preſerve them from the poſſibility of

(t) Hom. on Repent. p. 349. (v) Above, p. 107. (w) Above, p. 137. (x) Mr. Clapham's Ser. p. 17. (y) Dr. Croft's Thoughts, p. 49. (z) See Mr. Polwhele's Letter, p. 39—82; Mr. Clapham's Ser. p. 21; Review, &c. p. 23; &c.

ſuch a ſtate of ſuffering as this. Neither the nature nor certainty of this puniſhment, it ſhould be conſidered, is at all altered by men's ſceptical conceptions concerning it. The deſtruction of the old world was neither mitigated nor averted by the general inapprehenſion reſpecting it which obtained[a]. The overthrow of Sodom proved equally certain and equally awful, notwithſtanding the admonitions of Lot to his relatives to eſcape were regarded as a mocking[b]. Nor can we perceive how theſe admonitions were expreſſive of his want of charity for them.

"Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we perſuade men[c]." Believing ourſelves the awful reality of God's ſolemn denunciations againſt thoſe, "who obey not the goſpel[d]," we entreat ſuch characters to "flee for refuge to the hope this goſpel ſets before them[e];" to flee unto him who is exalted "to be a prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance and forgiveneſs of ſins[f]." "As though God did beſeech them by us, we pray them in Chriſt's ſtead, to be reconciled to God[g]."—While, on the one hand, we exhibit to them the bleſſedneſs a perſeverance in their preſent courſe would forfeit, and the nobler motives of the goſpel, in order to allure them to repentance; on the other, we ſolemnly warn them "to flee from the wrath to come[h];" and conſtantly aſſure them, that "except they repent, they muſt all periſh[i]."

This is the encouragement we give men "to live as they liſt[k]!" Thus do "Evangelical preachers circulate doctrines, which powerfully impel bad men on in the career of wickedneſs, by holding out the proſpect of impunity[z]!" So much juſtice is there in the charge that we "open a road

(a) See Matt. xxiv. 38. (b) Gen. xix. 14. (c) 2 Cor. v. 11.
(d) 2 Theſ. i. 8. (e) Heb. vi. 18. (f) Acts v. 31.
(g) 2 Cor. v. 20. (h) Matt. iii. 7. (i) Luke xiii. 13.
See Note (z) above, p. 295. (k) Above, p. 268. (z) See Mr. Fellowes' Anticalviniſt, Preface, p. 4.

to heaven for ſinners of every deſcription without the trouble of repentance [k]!

If however we again attempt to recriminate, our opponents will not eaſily exculpate themſelves from the charge that *they* greatly undermine and weaken this main banner againſt the general overflowings of wickedneſs and immorality. With their extenuated views of the effects of the fall, of the rigour of the law, and of the malignity of ſin [l], they do not readily conceive that the worſt of men can deſerve to ſuffer "the bitter pains of eternal death." It is a doctrine not very reconcileable with their notions of the object of God in our creation, and their reſolution of all the Divine Attributes into thoſe of pure Mercy and Benevolence [m]. And, from the little uſe they make of it themſelves, and the ſeverity with which they treat the ordinary ſcripture uſe of it by others, there certainly remains a doubt whether or not they really believe the doctrine. For, whatever may be ſaid to the contrary, and however ungrateful the ſubject may be, if the doctrine is *really believed*; nay, if it is only thought probable, or even poſſible, ſo far is its extreme awfulneſs from furniſhing a reaſon for generally concealing it, that this conſideration is the very ſtrongeſt reaſon why impenitent ſinners ſhould hear it honeſtly proclaimed. But, to ſay the leaſt, theſe Divines labour to *mitigate* the apparent ſeverity of this threatened puniſhment, and to make as little as poſſible of the awful repreſentations of ſcripture reſpecting it.

"The diſcourſes of Jeſus," Mr. Polwhele ſays, . . . "never diſtract the ſoul by accumulating images of horror, and

---

(k) See above, p. 169. (l) See above Ch. 4. p. 129. &c.
(m) See Dr. Paley's Mor. and Polit. Philoſ. Ch. on the Benevolence of God.

minutely painting the ſcenes of everlaſting torment[n]." Nay, the notion that "Religion impoſes the command to believe this, and to do that, under pain of eternal perdition," Mr. P. conſiders as an obvious cauſe of infidelity[z]. ——Mr. Gilpin repreſents the doctrine reſpecting "the eternity of future puniſhments," as wholly "uncertain;" and would by all means baniſh the diſcuſſion of it from the pulpit[y].

(n) Third Letter, &c. p. 39, Note. This then we are to ſuppoſe, is the abſurd conduct of Dr. Hawker. Mr. P. however has not ſhown, in what part of this Divine's writings there is a greater accumulation of alarming images and declarations, than what is found in our Lord's diſcourſes, which are recorded Matthew v. 17—30; vii. 13—23; xviii. 6—9; xxiii. 13—36; xxiv. 1—51; xxv. 1—46; Mark ix. 42—49; Luke vi. 24—26; xviii. 24—25. Does our Lord in ſeveral of theſe ſcriptures only make ſome ſparing and "obſcure alluſions" to the "everlaſting puniſhment" of the wicked? (z) Letter, p. 82.

(y) See above, p. 137.—A writer in the Antijacobin Review has been peculiarly unfortunate in regard to this ſubject and to Mr. Gilpin. Indignant at another Critic for inſinuating, that ſome miniſters do not properly inſtruct their flocks "in evangelical truth," this writer undertakes to produce "two inſtances which *entirely defeat*" the inſinuation: and having repeated the *titles* of Mr. G.'s Sermons, the matter is thought decided incontrovertibly, and brother Reviewer is ſtyled an "uncharitable Reviler." Deſirous however of improving the victory, our writer proceeds, "They (the clergy) do not ſquare the ſcripture to their own ſuperficial philoſophy, like Monthly Reviewers, when they deem *everlaſting puniſhment* unjuſt. They ſee the mercy and the juſtice of God diſplayed in that moſt awful truth, in a manner the moſt conſiſtent, and the moſt favourable to ſalvation. . . . To believe puniſhment to be *not* eternal, is to return to the old notion of *purgatory*. . . . The eternity of future ſufferings is a doctrine which man cannot argue down, while he is a true believer."—This ſurely is producing Mr. Gilpin's divinity as a deciſive anſwer to the charge of want of orthodoxy, and at the ſame moment ſtrongly reprobating his notions! But after all, there is no ſafety in truſting to mere *titles* of things. See the Antijacobin Review for April 1801, p. 428—433.

Others deny that this punishment of eternal death, was implied in the sentence denounced against Adam [o]. Mr. Ludlam says, this "is no where clearly asserted in scripture, though it is by certain divines [p]." Dr. Paley supposes, "there may be *very little to chuse*" between the conditions of some who are admitted into heaven, and of some who are cast into hell [q]. Dr. Hey favours the same sentiment. "Being saved and being damned," he says, "admit of various degrees of happiness or misery, *without limit*:" And, that no "*great degree* is necessarily implied in the word 'everlasting;'" but that "*every fine, however small* is an *everlasting punishment* [r]." This surely is making heaven and hell more nearly resemble each other, than the ordinary representations of them in scripture would suggest. When the Judge seated on his throne shall have divided all nations into two classes, and shall say to one of them, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;" and unto the other, "Depart ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels [s];" one would not suppose that only so trifling a difference of condition may be implied; that to "go into life everlasting," and "into everlasting fire," may be a state so nearly similar!

Of the same nature are the observations of Dr. H., that the "expression" used in our 9th Article, "God's wrath and damnation,' is more terrible in the sound than in the sense:" that "damnation is only equivalent to judgment;" that "it does not of itself imply judgment *after death*, nor *any determinate degree* of evil;" and "is as applicable to the *Socinian Scheme*, as to any other;" that "a verdict

---

(o) Above, p. 135. (p) Six Essays, p. 23. (q) See Mor. and Pol. p. 41. (r) Vol. iii. p. 106. "Yet we may," he observes, "easily suppose too small a degree of evil, as well as too large a one, to be implied in the word 'damned.'"—Ibid.

(s) Matt. xxv. 31, &c.

againſt any one, in our civil judicatures, is judgment, or *damnation*, how *ſmall ſoever the fine* (t):" that "owing to the moderation of our church, we are not called upon to ſubſcribe to the *eternity* of hell-torments," nor "even to condemn thoſe, who preſume to affirm, that all men will be finally ſaved." "Though," however, he adds, "one were inclined to *hope* with Dr. Hartley, that *all men will be happy ultimately*; that is, when puniſhment has done its proper work in reforming principles and conduct," in other words, when our ſtate of purgatory is ended, "yet to *affirm* it, muſt always be preſumption (v)."

And muſt not all theſe reſervations, palliatives, and limitations of the plain language of ſcripture and our church on this ſubject, tend exceedingly to leſſen the dread of puniſhment in the minds of wicked men? Can God's awful denunciations againſt impenitent ſinners have their proper effect in reſtraining them from iniquity, if they are not honeſtly and generally ſet before them? Is not this, in ſo many ways, ſuggeſting to them, that their puniſhment may not by any means be ſo dreadful, as it is often apprehended? Nay, is it not even leaving them not wholly without a *hope* that, after all, and however they perſiſt in their wicked courſe to the end of their lives, they may be *ultimately happy*?

As therefore it has been before proved that our ſyſtem exhibits the ſtrongeſt incentives to love, gratitude, and every principle that can influence the better part, and better paſſions of men, ſo it muſt here be confeſſed, that as far as the *fear of puniſhment* can operate as a guardian of morals,

---

(t) Vol. iii. p 154, 155. (v) Vol. ii. p. 390. The condemnation of thoſe who affirmed this, Dr. H. ſays, "was required in the laſt Art. of Edward VI. and he thinks reaſonably." "The *title* of the Article, 'All men ſhall not be ſaved at length,'" he obſerves, "ſeems inaccurate; as, I think, the meaning is, It is not to be *affirmed*, that all men ſhall be ſaved finally; or after a *definite* time." Ibid. Note.

we alſo have clearly the advantage. The effect ſurely muſt be greater when ſuch puniſhment, in its awful nature and unqueſtionable certainty, is kept generally in view, than when it is only now and then ſhyly and doubtingly hinted at, and when the ordinary ſcripture repreſentations of it are ſo ſoftened and palliated.

How void of foundation then, in this view alſo, is the charge we would refute. And how ill does it become the mouths of thoſe who advance it. Whether we attend to the motives to good works, chiefly urged upon thoſe who are conſidered as true Chriſtians, or to thoſe incentives to repentance which more eſpecially regard the wicked, ſo worſe than deſtitute are they of any ſolid ground for boaſting over us.

SECTION III.

A vindication of CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS; *an appeal to* EXPERIENCE, *and to the* CONCESSIONS *of our opponents, on the point; and a concluſion that it is the* STRICTNESS *of our Morality which gives the offence.*

SO much we may even venture to affirm of the doctrines of thoſe among us, whoſe ſtrong ſenſe of the evils attending the oppoſite errors, has led them to uſe language the leaſt defenſible on the ſubject, and whoſe works our opponents attack with ſuch peculiar virulence. We will inſtance, without undertaking the defence of all their modes of expreſſion, as perſons of this deſcription, and ſtanding in this ſituation, the two late well-known Divines, Mr. Romaine and Mr. Hervey.

Reſpecting a work of the former of theſe Gentlemen, a Correſpondent of the Antijacobin, who ſubſcribes himſelf "A friend to the Eſtabliſhment," thus expreſſes himſelf: "One of the Reviewers ſaid on Mr. Romaine's Life of Faith, 'It was a pity that the life of faith ſhould be the death of common ſenſe.' But I would go further, and ſay, that the life of ſuch faith, ſuch ſolitary, modern, antinomian faith, is the *death of all reaſon, all pity, all humility, all meekneſs*. A few favourite notions are denominated faith, and this faith is exalted above every Chriſtian grace, and may *exclude every moral virtue* [a]."

This is a heavy charge. If however this zealous churchman will compare the definition of faith given in this work, with that of our Homily, he will find, that they are preciſely, in effect, the ſame. Thus, the Homily ſays, "The right and true Chriſtian faith is, not only to believe that the holy ſcripture is true, but alſo to have a ſure truſt and confidence in God's merciful promiſes to be ſaved from everlaſting damnation by Chriſt: whereof doth follow a loving heart to obey his commandments [b]."—Mr. Romaine, engaged expreſsly like the Homily to ſhow "what true faith is," ſays, It refers to the Word of God, and that the perſon who really believes, "aſſents to it, relies upon it, and acts accordingly." "This," he adds, "is faith [c]:" and it is clearly nothing elſe than a compreſſion of the words of the Homily. But, if this is the caſe, theſe hard epithets of this "friend to the eſtabliſhment," apply equally to the faith of the eſtabliſhed church, as to that of the work in queſtion.

And then, as to theſe "favourite notions" being "the *death of all reaſon, and all piety*, and excluding *every moral virtue*:" Reſpecting the death of reaſon, I ſhall advance nothing; becauſe, enthuſiaſts like us, will not be allowed to have any judgment in what its life conſiſts; and becauſe, the

(a) For May 1799, p. 77. (b) On Salva. p. 18.
(c) Life of Faith, 4th Edit. p. 24.

whole syſtem of our doctrines, we know, appear irrational to a Socinian Reviewer. In direct contradiction however to the other part of the charge, and in the moſt perfect conſonance with the notions of our church, it is expreſsly maintained in this little work, that "every man in his natural ſtate, before the grace of Chriſt and the inſpiration of his ſpirit, has *no faith*:" that "a man who lives careleſs in ſin has no faith," but is a "practical Atheiſt:" that the formaliſt, who is content with the form of godlineſs and denies the power of it, has not true faith:" yea, that "he who is ſo far enlightened as to underſtand the way of ſalvation, and is deſtitute of love, has not true faith[d]."——How then can it be affirmed that this faith deſtroys "all piety, and may exclude every moral virtue," when all careleſs ſinners, formaliſts, and thoſe who are deſtitute of the genuine love of God and man, are thus poſitively declared not to poſſeſs it? How can ſuch a work be "the death of all humility," when none but truly penitent ſinners, and humble Chriſtians, are addreſſed in it, or warranted to take one word of encouragement from it?

It is alſo, on the other hand, maintained, that all who believe "dread whatever is oppoſite to the Will of God;" that "the love of Chriſt ſhows ſin in its exceeding ſinfulneſs;" that they are required "to reſiſt unto blood, ſtriving againſt ſin;" and that "faith working by love to Chriſt, gains daily victory over it[e]." Always is it ſuppoſed, that the Redeemer ſtands equally engaged, and is equally qualified, to ſave all who truſt in him, from the *practice*, as from the condemnation of ſin. Commenting on the paſſage, 'He will ſubdue our iniquities;' "He *will* do it," it is obſerved; "He is engaged by promiſe, by office, it is his glory, to ſave his people from the dominion of their ſins[f]." To the ſame purport are the remarks on Romans, vi. 14; and Galatians, v. 16: "Grace is Almighty to ſubdue ſin.... Ye ſhall not fulfil the luſts of the fleſh, either in word or

(d) Ibid. p. 25—27. (e) P. 121, 266. (f) Page, 254.

deed; not *one* of them shall reign over you[g]." And, having exhorted the believer to apply to Christ by prayer for strength to resist temptation; "Sooner," it is added, "shall heaven and earth pass away than sin, any sin, thus left with Christ to be subdued, shall reign over thee[h]."

True believers are also every where represented as making a *daily and progressive improvement in virtue.* "Christ," it is said, "living, dwelling, and reigning in them by faith, will day by day weaken the strength of Sin, Satan, and the World; and by the power of his death and resurrection he will be conforming them more to his own image and likeness. He will by faith enable them to grow up into him in all things, as long as they live. They will be going on from strength to strength, till sin and death be swallowed up in victory[i]." "Until that happy time come," it is subjoined, "he has appointed certain means, in the use of which they are to wait for the continual receiving of grace." In the faithful use of these means, that is, especially in prayer, public worship, and the supper, they are represented as finding great delight, "which nothing can rob them of but sin," which makes them careful in their life and conversation to please their gracious Lord[k].

In another place this enemy to all pity and morality proceeds thus: "The same faith, working by love, has gained the hearts and affections of believers over to the interests of holiness, and the commandments now cease to be grievous. Love to Christ, who is perfect righteousness and holiness, cannot consist with the hatred of either; nay, they are renewed after his image in both; and renewed in knowledge, that they might know his precious image, and renewed in heart that they might love it; therefore being thus created anew in Christ Jesus, they will certainly in the inner man, delight in righteousness and true holiness[l]." .... "He (Christ) has perfectly secured the interest of holiness

(g) Page, 112. (h) P. 118. (i) P. 260. (k) P. 261, 262. (l) P. 267.

and the glory of the moſt holy God; for they are his workmanſhip, created unto good works, to love them, to do them, to walk in them as the way to the kingdom; and they live by faith upon Chriſt's ſtrength for Will and Power to do them, and upon his interceſſion for the acceptance of them.... To him they look for every thing needful, to enable them to glorify God in their lives, and to ſhow forth the virtues of him who hath called them; on his grace they rely that their converſation may be as becomes the goſpel of Chriſt, and that they may adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour in all things[m]."

Theſe extracts may ſuffice to ſhow, with what juſtice or propriety, a work like this can be repreſented as "the death of all piety," and as ſo exceedingly hoſtile to "every Chriſtian grace, and every moral virtue. It will not, ſurely, be eaſy for this "friend to the Eſtabliſhment," to prove himſelf a friend to truth. The caſe of the Eſtabliſhment is truly deplorable if it has need of ſuch friendſhip as this. If in this work there be modes of expreſſion, or even ſentiments, which ſome found Divines of our church may not wholly approve, ſurely it can have no ſuch tendency, and deſerves no ſuch reprobation, as is here preſented to us.

The works of Mr. Hervey, Mr. Ludlam characterizes, as "abounding with numberleſs matters either falſe or unintelligible, or unſcriptural;" and would aſſure us, that Mr. H. has bidden "adieu to common honeſty [n]," in the compoſition of them. Others have ſpoken much of the *Antinomian* tendency of theſe writings [o]. And, it ſhall be allowed, that they are as liable to objection in this view, as any productions within the ſcope of our apology. Many, with our views of juſtification, think this Divine has proceeded *too far* in guarding againſt the improper uſe of works, but not one of them will inſinuate that he has not gone far enough.

(m) p. 269. (n) Six Eſſays, p. 57, 58, and Note.
(o) Weſley, Bellamy.

And yet hear how even *he* ſpeaks on the ſubject. Amidſt a great deal to the ſame effect,

"Holineſs," he obſerves, "is one of the moſt *diſtinguiſhed bleſſings* in our ſyſtem; nay, is the very CENTRAL BLESSING, *to which all the others verge*; *in which they all* TERMINATE.—— Were we choſen from eternity? It was for this purpose, that we may be holy and unblameable in Love. Are we called in time? It is to this intent, that we may ſhow forth the praiſes of him, who hath called us out of darkneſs into his marvellous light. Are we created again in Chriſt Jeſus? It is, to capacitate us for acceptable ſervice, and to fit us unto every good work[p]." If, Mr. H. readily acknowledges, the ſcheme of juſtification by faith had the ſmalleſt tendency to ſupport ungodlineſs, or to diſcourage virtue, it would doubtleſs be worthy of univerſal abhorrence. But he appeals not only to the nature of the doctrine, and the reaſon of things, but to the experience of believers, whether its tendency is not "quite the reverſe[q]." And after expatiating on the immenſeneſs of their bleſſings, and the means through which theſe bleſſings are procured to them, the aſtoniſhing love and ſufferings of the Redeemer; "Is it poſſible," he proceeds, "for the contemplation of ſuch goodneſs, to weaken the motives, or relax the ſprings of obedience? As ſoon may lenient balms kill, and rankeſt poiſons cure. Is ſuch a belief calculated to diſcourage duty, and patronize licentiouſneſs? Juſt as much as vernal ſhowers are fitted to cleave the earth with chinks, or ſummer's ſuns to glaze the waters with ice .... No. Nothing, nothing is ſo effectual to beget the moſt *irreconcileable abhorrence* of all ungodlineſs, to make the remembrance of it bitter as wormwood, the temptations to it horrible as hell.... Other motives may produce ſome external ſervices; but this conciliates the will; this proſelytes the affections; this captivates the very

(p) Theron &c. Letter 10. p. 239. (q) Ibid.

ſoul, and makes all its powers, like the chariots of Ammina-dab, ready, expedite, and active in duty [r]."

He ſhows moreover, what an exalted virtue theſe principles of faith and love produced in the Apoſtles and ancient Saints; and abounds with obſervations like theſe [s]: "Where ever God works true faith, he plants the ſeed of *univerſal holineſs*, and provides for the propagation of *every virtue* [t]." "The doctrine of faith is called by St. Paul, a doctrine according to godlineſs; exquiſitely contrived to anſwer all the ends, and ſecure every intereſt of real piety. The grace of faith St. Jude ſtyles, 'our moſt holy faith;' intimating that it is not only productive of holineſs, but that the moſt refined and exalted holineſs ariſes from it [v]." "The Scripture lays ſuch a ſtreſs upon faith, becauſe it is a ſure, a ſovereign means of 'purifying the heart,' and never fails to 'work by love [w].'" This laſt ſentiment, like our church, Mr. H. inſiſts upon peremptorily; affirming, "that our juſtification and ſanctification are *abſolutely inſeparable*;" that a genuine faith and a conſcientious obedience are as *indiſſolubly connected*, as gravity and ſtone, or heat and fire [x].—Such an Antinomian is Mr. Hervey! Such is the language of a Divine, whoſe notions on the ſubject are among the *leaſt* defenſible.

But will Mr. Ludlam maintain that the ſubject of his animadverſions, the "Scripture Characters," has an immoral or an ungodly tendency? Has he not, amidſt all his charges of folly and fanaticiſm, been conſtrained to allow that this is a "pious and well-meant work [y];" and that the author of it "is a man of ſenſe and piety [z]?" Has it not extorted a ſimilar commendation from the Britiſh Critic [a], an authority equally free from ſuſpicion?

(r) Ibid. p. 242—245. (s) Ibid. 245—268. (t) Ibid. p. 248. (v) Lett. 11. p. 268. (w) Lett. 10. p. 249. (x) Dia. 10. p. 341. (y) Four Eſſays, p. 108. (z) Six Eſſays, p. 56. (a) Vol. iv. p. 260.

Or will Mr. L. advance this charge againſt the Works of that object of his implacable diſlike, the late Joſeph Milner? Does he know that the profeſſed and characteriſtic deſign of this Author in his "Hiſtory of the Church," is, to celebrate *only* "*genuine piety*;" that in contradiſtinction to the bulk of his predeceſſors, who have reſpected other matters "more than godlineſs and virtue," and made ſuch "large diſplays of eccleſiaſtical wickedneſs," his eſpecial object is, to write the hiſtory of thoſe perſons "*whoſe diſpoſitions and lives have been formed by the rules of the New Teſtament*[b]?" And has he not faithfully adhered to his plan, ſhown the connection between doctrine and practice, and recognized nothing as real Chriſtianity, but in proportion as it has approached to this ſtandard; in proportion as it has thus regulated men's diſpoſitions and lives[c]? Is it, for the defectiveneſs, or the eminency of his charity, liberality, and good works in general, that he ſo fully dilates upon, and ſo highly extols, the character of Cyprian[d]? Is it for the coldneſs or the fervour of the piety they breathe, that he likewiſe dwells with ſuch peculiar ſatisfaction on the works of that great model of our church, St. Auſtin[e]? In what merely human compoſition is there diſplayed a more cordial reliſh for whatever is excellent? Who will affirm, that by the peruſal of this work, his ſtandard of morality has been lowered, or his ſtimulus to the practice of it abated? And, is not the ſame ſpirit every where conſpicuous in Mr. M.'s Sermons? Yet there cannot be a more ſtrenuous advocate for our doctrine of juſtification.

Or, can it be ſhown that this is the tendency of the Works of Mr. Scott, another firm and conſiſtent ſupporter of this doctrine, and whoſe ſentiments have lately been re-

---

(b) See his Preface. (c) See Vol. i. Ch. 22; and the whole Work paſſim. (d) Ibid. Cent. 3. Ch. 7. p. 351—Ch. 15. p. 500. (e) Vol. ii. Cent. 5. Ch. 2. p. 323—Ch. 9. p. 510.

preſented as ſo ſuſpicious [f]? Can it be proved of his numerous writings [z], that they either tend, or are deſigned, to depreciate morals? We appeal to every page, to every paragraph of them, for proof of the direct contrary. A ſingle paſſage ſhall be adduced as a ſpecimen. "The whole plan of redemption," ſays this moſt ſcriptural Theologian, commenting on Phil. i. 11, "the humiliation and ſufferings of the Divine Saviour, the inſpiration of the holy ſcriptures, the preached goſpel, and the inſtituted ordinances, are *entirely deſigned to render men fruitful in good works*; and if this end be not anſwered in thoſe who profeſs the goſpel, the *whole*, as to them, has hitherto been ineffectual.... Even the work of the Holy Spirit, in regenerating, illuminating, convincing, and comforting the ſoul, is entirely ſubſervient to the Lord's deſign of rendering it *holy and fruitful*: nor is any knowledge, experience, faith, joy, or confidence *genuine*, which is not *connected with fruitfulneſs*, or *productive* of it [g]."

Nor let it be inſinuated, as it often is [h], that what we mean by holineſs and good fruit, is ſomething that has little or no connection with the *good of ſociety*. For this writer proceeds, "Whatever part of a believer's conduct tends to make known the glorious perfections and works of God, and to promote the credit of the goſpel, the converſion of ſinners, and the peace or purity of the church; whatever may diminiſh the ſum total of ignorance, error, vice, and miſery in the world, or increaſe that of true knowledge, wiſdom, holineſs, and felicity; in ſhort *whatever does real good to mankind*, in their temporal and ſpiritual concerns, *is good fruit*: all elſe ſhould be counted but as leaves and bloſſoms. An upright, faithful, blameleſs, benevolent, peaceable, forgiving, pure, and holy converſation: a cheerful,

(f) See Antijac. Rev. for September, 1799. p. 33, &c. (z) See his Commentary on the Old and New Teſtament, his Eſſays, Sermons, &c. (g) Treatiſe on Growth in Grace, p. 44. (h) See Clapham's Sermon, p. 17.

thankful, reſigned, and patient ſpirit; a reverential, and ſtated attendance on the ordinances of public and family worſhip; a conſcientious regard to the Will of God, in our dealings with men, and in our behaviour towards all who are in any way related to us, even when they neglect their reciprocal duties; and an habitual moderation in all the purſuits, intereſts, and pleaſures of life, have a manifeſt tendency thus to adorn our profeſſion and benefit mankind. To theſe we may add a faithful improvement of the talents committed to our ſtewardſhip; whatever meaſure of authority, influence, abilities, learning, or riches, may be aſſigned to us by our common maſter: for with ſuch talents we may do proportionable good; provided we be influenced by evangelical principles, avail ourſelves of advantages and opportunities, and aſk wiſdom of God to direct us in our endeavours, &c. &c. We cannot think ourſelves *perfect* in this life, without being juſtly chargeable with pride; nor can we neglect to pray for perfection and follow after it, without criminal neglect, and toleration of ſin in our hearts and lives[i]."

Now, if it is not uncharitable, unjuſt, monſtrous, to affirm or to inſinuate, of thoſe who uſe this language, that their doctrines lead to *licentiouſneſs*, and that they nearly exclude *morality* from their ſyſtem of religion, there is ſurely nothing to which theſe epithets can be applied. Yet to theſe ſentiments of Mr. Scott, the whole body of Divines under vindication will ſubſcribe. They are our common ſentiments, on the ſubject.——But there is no end of particularizing from ſuch a hoſt of Witneſſes. To notice therefore but one inſtance more;

Can Mr. Daubeny ſubſtantiate this charge againſt the celebrated Works he undertakes to reprehend on the point? Can he indeed ſhow that theſe Works tend to endanger the exiſtence, lower the tone, or relax the obligations of morals?

(i) Growth in Grace, p. 44—46.

As soon, to adopt Mr. Hervey's allusion [k], may he prove, that the firemen, by playing the engine, and pouring in water, contribute to the burning the house to the ground, and laying the furniture in ashes. One of these publications, however, Mr. D. represents as describing faith in a manner, "calculated to lead the reader to a conclusion subversive of the great design of the gospel covenant [l];" as containing matter "more favourable to enthusiasm, than practical Christianity [m];" as describing "the observance of the moral precepts as vain wisdom, and false philosophy [n];" &c. &c. Yet, however inconsistently, and notwithstanding this severe charge against some parts of this Work, Mr. D. informs us it would give him pleasure to be the means of extending its circulation; and is constrained to believe, "that the reader must be either good or bad in the extreme, who does not derive benefit from it;" and that it "will produce a more extensive, and on many minds a more powerful effect, than *any instruction* from the pulpit, or even from the pen of a Divine [o]."

Nor have any persons, who are at all worthy of notice, ventured to question either the intention, the tendency, or even the actual good effect of this publication, whatever oblique hints, and insinuations of another kind, a dislike to some of its doctrines has occasioned. The Critics, who are deservedly in the highest repute with the Orthodox, "recommend it to the public as one of the *most impressive books* on the subject of religion, that has appeared within their memory;" as "a work in which the author *labours by every mode of argument, to revive* the decaying zeal and love for religion;" as "perhaps, intended as a providential instrument towards not only preserving this nation firm, amidst the wreck of religious, moral, and political opinions in

---

(k) Dia. x. p. 341. Note. (l) Guide, p. 311. (m) Ibid. p. 313. (n) Ibid. p. 297. (o) Ibid. p. 376.

many parts of Europe," but even arouſing it "to a *purer practice*, and more *ardent attachment* to the truth [p]."

Similar is the judgment formed of this Work by one of the moſt diſtinguiſhed of our Prelates. The Biſhop of London mentions it as having, in conjunction with ſome other ſimilar publications, "called the attention of the people of this land to the fundamental doctrines and duties of the goſpel, and *preſſed upon them the neceſſity of immediate reformation*, by arguments not eaſy to be withſtood;" and as having produced *good effects* "certainly very conſiderable [q]." And few human productions have received greater honour, than this has, from the truly pious in general [r].

But that Mrs. More's Publication alſo contains doctrines dangerous to morality, Mr. D. has written a Book to ſhew. This prodigy of female underſtanding, and uſeful virtue, he charges with maintaining a poſition which may lead to a "*very dangerous concluſion*; that of lulling the formal profeſſor of Chriſtianity into a *fatal ſecurity*, on a ſubject of the firſt importance;[s]" with giving ſuch an interpretation of St. Paul, as "renders *human exertion needleſs*, . . in the work of ſalvation [t];" with exchanging his "argument in favour of Chriſtian practice, . . . for an *imaginary idea* [v];" and in ſhort, with making *nonſenſe* of it [w].

The Antijacobin Reviewers have approved of this cenſure, warranted the object of it for "an *error undoubtedly*," and denominated it giving "a *novel turn* to the Epiſtle of St. Paul [x]."—All this, indeed, is amidſt much inconſiſtent commendation. We ſay inconſiſtent, becauſe, if the work really contains doctrines of this tendency, whatever other excellencies it may poſſeſs, it deſerves the general diſapprobation of the Chriſtian miniſter.

(p) Brit. Crit. for Sept. 1797, p. 294, &c. (q) Ch. 1799, p. 35, and Note. (r) This appears from its rapid Circulation. (s) Letter to Mrs. More, p. 45. (t) Ibid. p. 31. (v) Ibid. p. 37. (w) Ibid. p. 32. (x) For Oct. 1799, p. 195.

But, that the particular doctrine in queſtion is neither new nor dangerous, has been fully ſhown above[y]. And, taken all together, ſuch, on the contrary, is the undeniable and extraordinary worth of this performance, that it has extorted the approbation, or rather, excited the aſtoniſhment, of nearly all perſons, of all ſentiments and perſuaſions, in whom there is a capability of approving real excellence[z]. It has proved invulnerable againſt the ſhafts of malignity itſelf; the "Enemy of all goodneſs," like his great Predeceſſor on another occaſion, having come and found nothing in it, but what has ſerved to diſplay his own malevolence, and to repulſe him foiled[a]. Yea, ſuch is its undoubted excellence, that "the favourable reception and extenſive circulation," which this and the laſt-mentioned publication have obtained, have been conſidered as indicative of the "returning ſerioufneſs," and remaining ſecurity of our nation[b].

As we cannot well have higher human authority on ſuch a point, let the judgment of the Prelate laſt referred to, ſerve as a ſpecimen of the opinion entertained of this work by ſenſible and pious Chriſtians. "It preſents to the reader," his Lordſhip ſays, "ſuch a fund of good ſenſe, of wholeſome counſel, of ſagacious obſervation, of a knowledge of the world, and of the female heart, of high-toned morality and genuine Chriſtian piety; and all this enlivened with ſuch brilliancy of wit, ſuch richneſs of imagery, ſuch variety and felicity of alluſion, ſuch neatneſs and elegance of diction, as are not, I conceive, eaſily to be found ſo combined and blended together in any other work in the Engliſh language[c]."

Is it not then, we aſk again, monſtrous, openly to affirm, or diſingenuouſly to inſinuate, that they in any ſenſe

---

(y) Page 273—285. (z) See the Britiſh Critic for June, 1799, p. 643; and the Antijac. as above, N. x. (a) See Peter Pindar's "Nil Admirari;" and the Critiques upon it. (b) See Biſhop of London's Ch. p. 36; Britiſh Critic September 1797. (c) Ch. as above.

depreciate virtue, whose intentions are thus benevolent, whose exertions are thus happy, and whose writings can be thus characterized? Yet these Writers too maintain the precise doctrines we are vindicating. Whatever comparative disadvantage these doctrines may sustain through our inferiority in treating them, *theirs* are the sentiments we would support, as the genuine doctrines of the Church of England. It cannot, we think, have escaped observation, how exactly similar the treatment of these two last mentioned works in particular is, to that which this same class of Divines bestow upon our established Writings; when amidst many high encomiums they affirm, "that the Compilers of them do not seem thoroughly *to have understood St. Paul*, on the subject of justification;" and that they have used expressions *somewhat too strong about works*[d]."

2. Neither are we by any means afraid of the result, if, in imitation of our church, we appeal to *Experience* in general, to determine the tendency of our doctrines.——Mr. Daubeny, Mr. Polwhele, Dr. Croft, &c. mention, with great apparent triumph, instances of the contrary; of persons professing these doctines who have profaned the Sabbath, been guilty of gross Immoralities, or "held up their hands at the Bar[e]." But nothing surely can be more disingenuous and absurd. For, not to say, that evil reports concerning such persons often originate in prejudices entertained against them from the very circumstance of their being, like Abel, *more righteous* than their brother; not to say, that all who should really be found of the character they mention would be disowned by us as hypocrites; not to say, that it is not the conduct of a few individuals that will turn the scale, either way; whence, it may be asked, proceed those troops of sabbath-breakers, irreligious and grossly immoral cha-

(d) Above, p. 208—209. (e) Guide. p. 86; Letter, p. 80, 81, Note; Thoughts, p. 35.

racters, that abound in almoſt every pariſh? Whence thoſe conſtant and copious ſupplies for Tyburn, Newgate, and Botany-Bay? Are they not chiefly from among the profeſſed adherents to *their* ſyſtem? Are they not generally lamentable ſpecimens of thoſe whom they repreſent as "members of the true Church of Chriſt, tranſlated from the world, delivered from the powers of darkneſs, and heirs with Chriſt of an eternal kingdom[f]?" Does Mr. Polwhele remember no inſtances of diſgraceful conduct in *Teachers* of religion, except thoſe in which he ſo apparently exults[z]? How inattentive muſt he then have been to Lord Kenyon's labours.

It muſt however, on all ſides, be acknowledged, that the *profeſſion* of the pureſt ſpeculative doctrines, is no infallible ſecurity for good conduct. Such is the deceitfulneſs and deſperate depravity of the human heart[g], that to accompliſh its wicked machinations, it can, Proteus like, aſſume every form, and preſent itſelf under every ſpecies of diſguiſe. And if, on one lamentable occaſion, through the intrigues of a few conſummate hypocrites, the *doctrines of Grace* were abuſed, we need only extend our retroſpect a very little further to ſee *thoſe of merit* producing effects at leaſt equally deplorable. We deny however that the doctrines which thoſe Agents of miſchief *pretended* to hold, were ſuch as are here defended. If they profeſſed certain parts of the ſame ſyſtem, theſe they ſo extended as to annihilate the reſt, which gave another form and another ſpirit to the whole. But in fact, when tried in our ſtandard they are unqueſtionably proved hypocrites. In this caſe, the apology for the doctrines they profeſſed is, that they could not be more happily efficacious becauſe they were not really embraced. And the frequent alluſion to this event,

---

(f) See above, p. 115, &c.
(g) See Jer. xvii. 9.
(z) See his Letter, p. 80.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

which our opponents make [h], is just as candid and just as material in the question, as it would be continually to refer *them* to the black conduct of those zealous opposers of justification by faith alone, Bonner and Gardiner.

No. Amidst all the infirmities and imperfections, which, as what "all flesh is heir to," the sincere adherents to the doctrines of Grace have to lament in themselves, it cannot reasonably be doubted, but that, taken Mass for Mass, there is amongst them a more marked abstinence from gross vice, and voluptuous dissipation; a more regular observance of religious ordinances; a more habitual sense of divine things, and gratitude towards the Saviour; a more characteristic regard to the Will and Authority of God in their proceedings; more strenuous exertions to mend and bless mankind; in short, more real godliness, soberness, and righteousness [i], than are to be found among the opposers of these doctrines. Whatever *occasional* stain evangelical tenets may have received, through the assumption of them by hypocrites, from which danger no principles are free, but to which their peculiar excellence may perhaps peculiarly expose them; wherever any considerable Reformation has been effected by Christianity; any thing which has materially distinguished the characters of individuals, bodies of people, or places, from what they were before, or from such as have the mere "form of godliness," these doctrines have been at the bottom of it.

Nor would it be difficult to shew, if this were our task, that, as a general rule, the piety of men has been cold and their morality languid, in exact proportion to their distance from this Sun of our system, SALVATION BY GRACE, THROUGH FAITH IN THE REEDEEMER, and its attendant doctrines; from the shorter aberrations of our more im-

---

(h) See Antijac. Review for Sept. 1799, p. 35; Dr. Hey's Lectures, Vol. iii. p. 265; Mr. Haggitt's Sermon, p. 11, 15.

(i) See Titus ii. 12.

mediate opponents to that "frigid zone of Chriſtianity" Socinianiſm; and from hence to that utter ſtarvation and deſtruction of every thing religious and good, modern French Philoſophiſm.

In ſupport of what *is* our poſition, we might ſhew the diſtinguiſhing purity of thoſe who conſcientiouſly maintained theſe doctrines in the firſt ages of Chriſtianity. We might inſtance how the growing corruptions were oppoſed, and what beneficial effects were produced, by the correſpondent doctrines of St. Auſtin. We might add the unſhaken firmneſs, patient ſuffering, exemplary purity, and extenſive uſefulneſs, of the Waldenſes and Albigenſes, amidſt the deplorable corruptions of the Romiſh Church in the 13th Century. We might exhibit, with all its beneficial effects, and with all its illuſtrious examples of zeal, conſtancy, and diſintereſtedneſs, in the cauſe of pure religion and virtue, the Reformation itſelf: for, that the bulk of the great Agents in this work, were profeſſedly of the ſentiments in queſtion, it is impoſſible to deny [k]. We might ſhew, that from the ſame principles have originated the chief and moſt ſucceſsful attempts to extend the bleſſings of Chriſtianity to heathen countries, ſince that period; and how backward to undertake the difficulties of this work, even when invited to it by a Chriſtian Government, *they* have generally been found, who *talk* ſo much about univerſal benevolence.

We might, to the ſame effect, enumerate the Thorntons, the Howards, and other modern characters, whoſe unbounded philanthropy, and unexampled exertions in the cauſe of ſuffering human nature, have rendered their names dear to every quarter of the globe.——But all this has been ſufficiently done already, and it would here be entering upon too large a field. For full evidence on the point we refer therefore to the "Hiſtory of the Church," by Mr.

(k) See Ch. i. p. 70, &c.

Milner[l]; and to the approved and unanſwerable work of Mr. Fuller[m].

We cannot however refrain from appealing to the crowded churches, the animated devotions, and the number of truly reformed and exemplary Chriſtian characters in every Town and Village in the Kingdom, where theſe doctrines are faithfully and diſcreetly inculcated, as contraſted with the general character of the congregations and people, where they are rejected. The characters of many who regularly attend the public ordinances of religion, it is admitted, may be doubtful; but that the caſe is bad where theſe ordinances are generally deſerted, there can be no doubt. "The form of religion *may* indeed be," Biſhop Butler, with his uſual good ſenſe, obſerves, "where there is little of the thing itſelf; but the thing itſelf *cannot* be preſerved amongſt mankind without the form[z]."

And whatever may be ſaid of the common people's total want of judgment in ſuch matters[n]; and however it may be more grateful and often more uſeful, to ſuch divines as Dr. Croft, to have the approbation of "the twentieth," (the Squire's for inſtance, or my Lord's) than that of "the nineteen[o];" it muſt not be forgotten, that it was eſpecially "to the poor that the goſpel was firſt preached[p]." There is ſomething in it peculiarly acceptable to their condition; and, as long experience has proved, wherever it is honeſtly and intelligibly delivered, and no material impediment of miniſterial character intervenes, there will they be gathered together. And if perſons of this claſs cannot judge of compoſition, they are ſhrewd judges whether a miniſter is really in earneſt to do them good; a matter of much greater importance even in regard to popularity.

(l) See Vol. i. Cent. iii. Ch. xxii; Vol. ii. Cent. v. Ch. ii—ix; Vol. iii. Cent. xiii. Ch. i—iv; and paſſim. (m) The Calviniſtic, &c., ſyſtems compared, paſſim. (z) Ch. annexed to his Analogy, p. 456. (n) See Mr. Polwhele's Letter, p. 85. (o) Thoughts, p, 12. (p) Mat. xi. 5.

We appeal moreover, to the common integrity of perſons in general, to ſay, whether, if, in the courſe of their travels or viſits, they ſhould meet with a ſtranger whoſe deportment ſeemed formed upon the model of *Scripture Morality*; who ſhould, as occaſion offered, diſcountenance ſwearing, drunkenneſs, and fooliſh talking, and introduce ſerious topics of converſation, they would not ſuſpect him of the principles in queſtion? We aſk them, whether this ſuſpicion would not be confirmed, if, by any means, they ſhould further learn, that in his habitual conduct the man was thus ſtrictly correct; that he abſtained from all places of public or private diſſipation, was regular in his devotions, conſcientious in his dealings, zealous in his attempts to do good to men's ſouls and bodies; and that his profeſſed motive was Love of God, and Gratitude to Chriſt? But if this, or any thing of this ſort, is the "Shibboleth [q]" by which perſons of our principles are diſtinguiſhed, however thoſe who think otherwiſe may entertain themſelves with the idea, it is a full acknowledgment of the ſuperior *moral effects* of ſuch doctrines.

But the *Conceſſions* on the point, which they make who diſlike our doctrines deſerve further attention.——For, on the one hand, however inconſiſtently, they acknowledge, to a very great extent, the *inefficacy* of their own principles. "Modern Chriſtianity," Mr. Daubeny admits, is a "dead thing;" and that ſuch is the "degenerate ſtate of things," that "the meaning annexed to the term, Vital Chriſtiany, is, to the bulk of profeſſing Chriſtians, become unintelligible." He "agrees with" Mr. Wilberforce, "in his account of the progreſſive decline of genuine Chriſtianity;" and ſpeaks of "the growing progreſs of adultery, perjury, and profaneneſs among us [r]."——The Britiſh Critic alſo "entirely

(q) See the Critical Review for Nov. 1797, p. 289. (r) Guide, p. 315, 316, 381.

agrees with Mr. W. as to the neceſſity that exiſts at preſent, for awakening many nominal believers to a recollection of the *moſt important doctrines* of Chriſtianity, and to an active, and heartfelt ſenſe of religion [s]." Mr. W's. picture of the defective and "commonly prevailing notions of profeſſed believers," this Critic allows, "is ſo drawn that it is not eaſy to deny the likeneſs [t]." The lamentations of the general body of theſe Divines, as will appear from our quotations below [m], are indeed truly diſtreſſing.

On the other hand, they cannot but admit that the doctrines which they oppoſe have done *ſomething* in the way of reformation. Dr. Croft indeed conſiders the matter as doubtful. "Whether," he ſays ſpeaking of the perſons in queſtion, "their doctrines have produced the reformation of manners which not only they themſelves, but even candid men of a different perſuaſion, contend for, admits of much doubt [w]." Mr. Clapham, however, the more candid man, it may ſeem, of the two, aſſures us, that *undoubted* evidence may be obtained "of *many*, who, immerſed in ſenſuality, and enſlaved to vice, have been, by the preaching of Methodiſm, reclaimed from their evil courſes [x]." The force of truth has alſo extorted the following admiſſion from the ſworn enemy of Dr. Hawker: "There does not appear," he ſays to the Dr., the ſlighteſt ground for Mr. Polwhele's uneaſineſs on account of your ſo far imitating Whitefield, as to quit haſtily your preſent reſidence, where you are ſo much looked up to, by thoſe *whoſe morals you have in a great meaſure reformed*, by adding the manners of the Gentleman to the accompliſhments of a Scholar. And I think it only juſtice to ſay, that your excellent Pulpit diſcourſes have been, in all probability, bleſſed to the conviction, comfort, and edification of many ſouls now on

(s) September 1797, p. 294. (t) Ibid. p. 298. (m) Ch. ix. Concluſion, §, 2. (w) Thoughts, p. 35. (x) Sermon, p. 16.

earth, and of others who are, doubtleſs, gone to glory [y]." Here then we would ſeriouſly aſk the Divines whoſe opinions we are combating, whether this is not more than can truly and generally be affirmed of *their* doctrines? And, whether the inſtances are not very rare, even of the outward reformation of notoriouſly wicked men, by their mode of preaching?

But not only the *good effects*, but the *ſuperior* good effects of our doctrines, in this point of conſideration, are allowed by an authority of all others the leaſt liable to ſuſpicion, the Monthly Reviewers. After quoting Mr. Wilberforce's appeal to experience on the ſubject, they add; "The *triumph* of *methodiſm* (for ſuch they denominate what Mr. W. is recommending as 'the very Chriſtianity on which our Eſtabliſhment is founded,) over the Socinian ſect, and over every other regular inſtitution, in the ſudden and *powerful effects* which it has, in many places, produced on the loweſt claſs of the people, is admitted." But "*ſucceſs*" they obſerve, "is in no caſe a proof of truth;" and that "notwithſtanding the *facts* in which Mr. W. *juſtly exults*, it ſtill remains to be examined whether the ſyſtem which has produced theſe effects be founded in reaſon and Scripture [z]." A ſimilar admiſſion is implied in their language on another occaſion. Speaking of "the people compoſing the methodiſtic ſect," "we believe," it is obſerved, "that they are as *moral characters* as the generality of their neighbours; and they form perhaps a deſcription of Chriſtians whoſe influence and example may be of *ſingular benefit* in a ſceptical and profligate age.... May not the *ſucceſs* of methodiſm be viewed as a good omen: as a proof that we need not deſpair of the Chriſtian Church, but that we ſhould rather be aſſured that it will flouriſh, if its appointed miniſters and paſtors, in the true ſpirit of the goſpel and with an ardor ariſing from ſerious conviction, ſteadily perform the duties of

(y) See Wotton's Letter to Dr. Hawker. (z) July, 1797. p. 248.

their office [m]?" Whatever then becomes of the truth and rationality of our doctrines, their *good effects*, which is our present subject, are here plainly admitted.

Nor must we omit what the Conductors of the British Critic have witnessed on the point. In their review of Mr. Fuller's answer to Dr. Toulmin and Mr. Kentish, Mr. F., it is observed, "to the knowledge of a sound Theologian, unites the talents of an acute and logical disputant." "The refutation," it is added, "which their (his opponents) arguments have received, will, we think, convince every candid mind, that the doctrines of unitarianism are not tenable on the ground of their moral tendency, when compared with those of a more evangelical description [a]."

Mr. F.'s comparison of the calvinistic and socinian systems, as to their moral tendency, to which we have especially appealed, these Critics also "strongly recommend." With the exception of a "few passages," those doubtless in which the spirit of the Dissenter is visible, it "appears," they say, "to be the work of a perspicuous and forcible reasoner, an acute disputant, a learned divine, and a very pious and devout man [b]." This is no mean testimony either of the man, or his doctrines. But Mr. Fuller is a *Calvinist*; the system he thus vindicates is the *calvinistic* one; and in exact proportion as our opponents are less "evangelical," and verge in their notions of grace and human powers towards Socinianism, in that proportion his arguments in regard to moral tendency against this system, apply also to theirs.

We will only add the testimony which these same Gentlemen have borne to the *effects* of our doctrines, as exemplified in the character of the late Mr. Romaine. This is important; both because this Divine's character has been specifically attacked; and because, with whatever propriety,

---

(m) March 1801, p. 316. (a) Vol. x. p. 685. (b) Vol. v. p. 431.

he has been repreſented as a *Chief* among us[c]. "It appears" then, they ſay, "that Mr. Romaine was *indefatigably active* during a miniſtry of near ſixty years, in *diſcharging the duties of his profeſſion, and in promoting charitable deſigns.* Whatever peculiar theological notionshe might entertain, *his piety appears to have been moſt fervent and ſincere; his charity ever watchful for opportunities of doing good;* his literary attainments reſpectable, and his knowledge *at all times wholly devoted to the advancement of religion.* To ſuch a man, ſurely, without preſumption, we may apply the words of Eliphaz, 'Thou ſhalt come to thy grave in a full age, like as a ſhock of corn cometh in, in his ſeaſon[d].'" May all who diſlike their ſentiments, be conſtrained thus to teſtify of the characters of our opponents! If *this* is the morality at which they are ſo angry, we muſt deſpair of pleaſing them. If this is the pattern we are imitating as Miniſters, they will not eaſily make us aſhamed of our conduct.

But what now, if, after all, it ſhould appear, that it is not the *laxneſs*, but the *ſtrictneſs* of our Morality, which excites ſuch complaints?——There are perſons, we know, from infallible authority, to whom the Redeemer's holy precepts and humbling doctrines are equally obnoxious. To whomſoever the different characters may belong, the ſcripture affirms nothing more plainly than this, that the truly righteous are diſliked by the world[e]. Nor is there any truth which has been more fully confirmed by experience. Iſhmael, in days of old, derided Iſaac[f]. And, "as then," the Apoſtle ſays, "he that was born after the fleſh, perſecuted him that was born after the ſpirit, even ſo it is now[g]." So both Jews and Heathens treated the Apoſtles and firſt Chriſtians. So the Papiſts treated the moſt virtuous of the Reformers. And ſo at all times has the World treated the genuine Diſciples of Chriſt; perhaps in exact

(c) See above, p. 307; and Chap. i. beginning; and Antijac. Rev. April, 1799. p. 362, &c. (d) Vol. vii. p. 690. (e) John xv. 18, 19. (f) Geneſis, xxi. 9. (g) Gal. iv. 29.

proportion as they have partaken of his Spirit, and trodden in his ſteps.

Perſons who act thus would be thought, indeed, only to diſcountenance hypocriſy, grimace, or enthuſiaſm; while they admire the beauty, and delight in the exerciſe of genuine virtue. But the manner in which ſhe was treated when exhibited in her moſt perfect form, and lovelieſt charms, in the Perſon of our Saviour, is a ſtanding and irrefragable proof of the contrary. And no excellence of character, no circumſpection of conduct, no freedom from needleſs peculiarities, has been ſufficient to preſerve ſuch as have been "transformed by the renewing of their mind[h]," from a portion of the ſame treatment; while thoſe who have been "conformed to this world," and have "walked after the courſe of it[i]," have invariably ſecured its friendſhip.

Nor will the reaſons of this circumſtance be wanting, to thoſe who conſider the enmity of the carnal mind againſt God and his law[k], the influence of Satan[l], and the reproach which a ſtrictly holy character reflects upon that of hypocrites, formaliſts, and perſons of more languid virtue. And it is worthy of obſervation, as what is moſt demonſtrable from fact, that it is the *living* according to the goſpel, and not the *profeſſion*, nor even the *preaching*, of its peculiar doctrines, in which the real umbrage conſiſts. Where there is a conformity to the world in practice, it readily excuſes peculiarity in theory.

But if ſuperior holineſs ſo commonly excites a peculiar diſlike, this may eaſily be the caſe in the affair before us; and it exceedingly behoves men to examine the grounds of their prejudices with a view to this circumſtance. There is a paſſage on the ſubject in the Book of Wiſdom well deſerving of attention. "Let us," ſay cer-

---

(h) Rom. xii. 2. (i) Ephes. ii. 2. (k) Rom. viii. 7. (l) See Ephes. vi. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 4; 1 Peter v. 8.

tain characters, "lie in wait for the righteous; because he is not for our turn, and he is clean contrary to our doings: he upbraideth us with our offending the law, and objecteth to our infamy the transgressions of our education. He professeth to have the knowledge of God; and he calleth himself the child of the Lord. He was made to reprove our thoughts. He is grievous unto us even to behold: for his life is not like other men's, his ways are of another fashion. We are esteemed of him as counterfeit: He abstaineth from our ways as from filthiness: he pronounceth the end of the just to be blessed, and maketh his boast that God is his Father... Let us examine him with despitefulness and torture, that we may know his meekness, and prove his patience [m]."——In a succeeding chapter they are represented as saying on a solemn occasion, "This was he whom we had sometimes in derision, and a proverb of reproach. We fools accounted his life madness; &c [n]."——We make no application of this passage but that which it necessarily makes of itself. If the manner in which any persons now speak and act in respect to us be exactly represented in it, they have certainly no occasion to boast of their precedent. If we are such mad, singular, boasting, obnoxious characters, as are here complained of, we trust we shall continue such to the season just alluded to.

But that it is the *strictness* of our moral system which in reality gives the offence, we have the evidence of our opponents themselves to prove. This is plainly expressed in the whole catalogue of their objections against the *strictness of our standard* of morals, and their attempts to substitute "*a more lenient rule* [o]." This is implied in their slighter requisitions as the *evidence* of a Christian state [p]. This is confessed in their charge that we "shew no indulgence to the common

(m) Ch. ii. 10—19. (n) Ch. v. 3, 4. (o) Above Ch. vii. §. 1. p. 221, &c. (p) Above, p. 114—126; 169, 170, 283, &c.

failings of human nature [q];" and in all they advance againſt the rigour and auſterity of our ſyſtem and our manners [r]. This the moſt reſpectable of them affirm in ſo many words. —Thus, in their review of a popular Work of the deſcription in queſtion, the Britiſh Critics ſpecify inſtances in which they think the ideas of the Author "are carried to a *miſtaken degree of ſtrictneſs*;" and ſay, "It is USUALLY CENSURED AS TOO SEVERE [s]."—Mrs. More confirms this teſtimony. "It has been warmly urged," ſhe ſays, "as an objection to certain religious books, and particularly againſt a recent work of high worth, ... that they have ſet the *ſtandard of ſelfdenial higher* than reaſon or even than Chriſtianity requires ... It has been ſometimes objected, even by thoſe readers who on the whole greatly admire the particular work alluded to, that it is UNREASONABLY STRICT in the *preceptive* and *prohibitory* parts [t]."

But if all this is ſo undeniably the fact, how could Mr. Clapham, before a learned Biſhop and a Congregation of Divines, appeal to the day of judgment, ſolemnly pledge himſelf to lay aſide "every prejudice," and to conſider the matter "fairly and impartially," as he "believes it will appear, when the ſecrets of all hearts ſhall be diſcloſed," and then exclaim concerning us; "The regulation of the moral temper, and the extinction of the malignant paſſions, do not alas! ſeem to be eſſential, or even ſubordinate parts of their ſyſtem [v]!" How could the grave Prelate "command [w]" ſuch groſs calumny to be publiſhed? With what face can Mr. Fellowes affirm, that we make "Chriſtianity itſelf an inſtrument for the propagation of vice and the diffuſion of miſery;" ... that our "doctrines tend to deter even good men from the practice of virtue, and powerfully impel bad men on in the career of wickedneſs [x]?" With what regard

(q) Clapham's Ser. p. 21. (r) Above, Ch. 7. § 1. 2. paſſim. (s) September, 1797. p. 295, 302. (t) Strictures, Vol. ii. p. 197. (v) Sermon, p. 9. (w) See the Title page. (x) Anticalviniſt, Preface, p. 1, 2.

to fact does Mr. Haggitt insinuate, that "the obvious effect of our doctrine is, to cut asunder the bonds of all moral obligation, and to put every man's life and property at the mercy of every fanatical audience [y]?" How can so many persons, under a profession of zeal for truth and justice, load us with such palpably false and ignominious charges on this subject? How groundless are the apprehensions which are pretended to be entertained by the more respectable and moderate of those who differ from us! How little must all these persons know of our doctrines, or how wilfully must they misrepresent them! From this full and extensive view of the subject of morality it appears,

That we hold equally the necessity of *Sanctification* as of *Justification*, and consider these blessings *equally* provided for in the covenant of grace: that we enforce the practice of good works *precisely on the same grounds which our church does*: and that, whether regard is had to the *Rule* of Morality, or to its *Sanctions*, or to the *degree* of it absolutely insisted upon as the *Evidence* of a Christian state; whether we argue a priori from the *natural tendency* of the doctrines themselves to promote genuine virtue, or whether a posteriori we have recourse to the *effects actually produced* by them, our moral system is *far stricter*, and our doctrines far more efficacious, than those of our opponents are.

(y) Visita. Sermon, Preface, p. 15.

CHAP. VIII.

The REASONS *of our adherence to the genuine doctrines of the Church of England ſtated; and a general* APOLOGY *for her doctrines.*

MUCH has been advanced to ſhow that we certainly do teach according to the plain doctrines of our Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies. It ſhall be the buſineſs of this chapter to inquire whether or not there are any ſolid reaſons for ſuch a conduct in the Miniſters of our church. And,

Firſt, We cannot on any other ground juſtify our SUBSCRIPTION to theſe forms of doctrine and worſhip.

That the Articles of our Church were intended by her founders for *Articles of belief*, to be underſtood, and taught, in their plain and obvious ſenſe, has been proved beyond all room for queſtion [a]. And to us, her Miniſters appear under very weighty obligations, ſo to underſtand and teach them now. Theſe forms ſtill contain and inculcate one explicit and ſpecific body of doctrine, and are nugatory and unmeaning if this doctrine is *not believed*. Still they are prefaced with the royal Declaration, which forbids any Miniſter from "putting his *own ſenſe or comment* to be the meaning of them," or "affixing *any new ſenſe* to any article;" and enjoins that they muſt be "taken in the literal and grammatical ſenſe," in their "plain and full meaning." Still the *deſign of the impoſer* is declared, in the title which the Articles bear, to be, the "*avoiding of diverſities of opi-*

(a) See eſpecially Chap. ii.

nions, and the eſtabliſhing of *conſent* touching true religion." Still our ſubſcriptions are demanded for the ſatisfaction of our Eccleſiaſtical Superiors concerning the doctrines we mean to teach, and muſt therefore imply in them what is neceſſary for that ſatisfaction.

But what is more, ſtill, in the moſt ſolemn manner, after ſpace for the matureſt deliberation, every candidate for Orders in our Church, declares in the act of ſubſcription, according to the 36th Canon, "that the Book of Common Prayer, containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God; that he alloweth the Book of Articles of Religion, and *acknowledgeth all and every* the Articles, therein contained, to be agreeable to the *Word of God*;" and that "*willingly, and ex animo, he ſubſcribes to theſe Articles, and to all things that are contained in them* [b]". And, according to the ſtatute which gives our Articles their legal authority, every Miniſter who is admitted to a Benefice is required to read them in the Church, with a declaration of his "*unfeigned aſſent to them* [c]."

And, if the obligation *can* be rendered more binding, ſtill are we daily exhorted to teach according to the plain and genuine doctrines of theſe articles by the *moſt active and eminent of our Biſhops*, and aſſured by them that a contrary procedure is equally pregnant with guilt and danger. Thus, in his famous Sermon on the ſubject, Biſhop Conybeare ſays; "Every one who ſubſcribes the Articles of religion, does thereby engage, not only not to contradict them; but his ſubſcription amounts to an approbation of, and an aſſent to, the truth of the doctrines therein contained, in the very ſenſe in which the compilers are ſuppoſed to have underſtood them." "All the conſiderations which can be urged to prove our *obligation to moral honeſty*, are ſo many arguments of our duty to ſubſcribe *without equivocation or reſerve*.

(b) See the Canon. (c) See the Statute of the 13th of Elizabeth; or Burnet on the Arts. Introduct. p. 8.

Nor can any thing be urged to juſtify or excuſe prevarication in this reſpect, which will not tend to deſtroy all mutual truſt and confidence among men. Whoever therefore is not really perſuaded that the doctrines contained in our articles are true, cannot ſubſcribe, without *an high violation of moral oneſty*, and a breaking in upon the fundamental principle, on which all ſociety muſt be built[d]."

Archbiſhop Secker, after obſerving to Candidates for Orders, that in ſubſcribing they have acknowledged the liturgy and articles of the Church of England to be agreeable to the Word of God, proceeds: "I hope you will think yourſelves bound, as you are, to be careful that the inſtructions which you give, and the doctrines which you maintain, in public and in private, be agreeable to that liturgy and thoſe articles: that you neither contradict, nor omit to inculcate and defend, on proper occaſions, the truths which they contain." "For," continues he, mentioning the engagements of our Ordination in general, "there can hardly be a caſe in which either *inſincerity, or even thoughtleſneſs*, would carry in it *heavier guilt*[e]."

Biſhop Barrington conſiders us bound, to inculcate and maintain "the doctrines which the laws protect, . . . by our *duty to God*, to the *laws of our country*, and the *engagements of our profeſſion*[f]."

"The Articles," Biſhop Pretyman adds, "are to be ſubſcribed in their plain and obvious ſenſe, and aſſent is to be given to them ſimply and unequivocally." "All perſons when they enter into holy orders, or are admitted to any eccleſiaſtical cure or benefice, are required by law to ſubſcribe theſe articles, that all who are employed in the Miniſtry of the eſtabliſhed church *ſhould unfeignedly believe the*

(d) See this Sermon in the "Encheiridion Eccleſiaſticum," lately publiſhed at Oxford, and recommended by the Biſhop of Durham, Ch. 1792. (e) See his Inſtructions to Candidates for Orders, in the Biſhop of Landaff's Tracts, Vol. vi. p. 108. (f) Ch. 1792. p. 17.

doctrines they contain." And, having mentioned "the profeſſed object of theſe articles," and the "indiſpenſable form of ſubſcription," and how "it behoves every one before he offers himſelf a candidate for holy orders, to peruſe carefully the articles of our church, and compare them with the written Word of God;" "If," his Lordſhip ſays, "upon mature examination he believes them to be authorized by Scripture, he may conſcientiouſly ſubſcribe them; but, if on the contrary, he thinks that he ſees reaſon to *diſſent from any of the doctrines aſſerted in them*, no hope of emolument or honour, no dread of inconvenience or diſappointment, ſhould induce him to *expreſs his ſolemn aſſent to propoſitions, which in fact he does not believe.* . . . "And let it," he ſubjoins, "be *ever remembered, that in a buſineſs of this ſerious and important nature, no ſpecies whatever of evaſion, ſubterfuge, or reſerve is to be allowed, or can be practiſed, without imminent danger of incurring the wrath of God*[g]."

All attempts therefore, under theſe circumſtances, to *juſtify ſubſcription without actual belief* of the plain doctrines of the articles, we cannot but conſider as groſs prevarication; an attack upon common integrity; a conduct moſt unbecoming the appointed Guardians of truth and ſincerity, and as juſtly expoſing the Church of which they are Miniſters to the ſcorn of her enemies.

In anſwer therefore to the notions of Dr. Paley, Dr. Balguy, &c. that our articles were only intended for *Articles of peace*, proſcriptions of certain ancient ſects, or whatever they call it, ſomething ſhort of this belief of the propoſitions they contain[h], we will only further add the words of Biſhop Burnet: Speaking of the time when theſe articles were compoſed, "One notion," his Lordſhip ſays, "that has ſince been taken up by ſome, ſeems not to have been then thought of; which is, that theſe were rather articles of

(g) Elements of Theology, Vol. ii. p. 566. (h) See Chap. i. p. 18.—22.

peace than of belief: ſo that the ſubſcribing was rather a compromiſe not to teach any doctrine contrary to them, than a declaration that they believed according to them. There appears *no reaſon for this conceit, no ſuch thing* being then declared: ſo that *thoſe who ſubſcribed, did either believe them to be true, or elſe they did groſsly prevaricate* [j]."

Nor does there appear more reaſon, for the more ingenious conceit of an *acquired ſenſe*, and a *tacit reformation*, about which we hear ſo much from the Drs. Hey, Powell, and their diſciples [k].——The very foundation on which they reſt this ſcheme of accommodation is groundleſs. We allow that words are mere arbitrary ſigns of whatever ideas the general Will of mankind annexes to them; and that, when a ſufficient reaſon appears, they may agree "to call the Sun by the name of the Moon, and the Moon by the name of the Sun." But this *new ſenſe* of terms is certainly only allowable as far as it is thus *agreed upon*, and *generally underſtood*, eſpecially among thoſe whom the ſubject they refer to immediately concerns.

According to Dr. Paley, to juſtify a departure from the original ſenſe of any form of words to which we aſſent, the inconveniency of adhering to this ſenſe muſt "be *manifeſt*, concerning which there *is no doubt* [l]." This he ſhows with reſpect to "Oaths to obſerve local ſtatutes;" and "Subſcription to Articles of religion," he ſays, "is governed by the ſame rule of interpretation." And it is on the ſuppoſition that this *new ſenſe* of the articles is *generally known* and *underſtood*, that it is defended by its advocates.

Thus, after a vaſt deal to the ſame effect, Dr. Powell obſerves, "How unjuſt then is the charge brought againſt the Engliſh Clergy, that, having departed from the meaning of their articles, they all continue to ſubſcribe what none believes! The accuſation is not only falſe, but the crime im-

(i) Hiſt. of the Reforma. Vol. ii. p. 169. (k) Ch. i. p. 22—26.
(l) Moral and Polit. Phil. p. 179.

poſſible. That cannot be the ſenſe of the declaration which *no one imagines to be the ſenſe;* nor can that interpretation be erroneous which *all have received* [m]."

This paſſage is approved, and thus explained, by Dr. Hey: "The Engliſh Clergy comprehends both parties; that which *makes* the Declaration, and that which *receives* it. If theſe are agreed, there *can* be no falſehood [n]." Of a ſimilar import is this Profeſſor's quotation from Cicero: "Rectiſſimè etiam illud receptum eſt, ut leges non ſolum ſuffragio Legiſlatoris, ſed etiam *tacito conſenſu omnium*, per deſuetudinem abrogentur [o]."

But nothing is further from the truth, than the ſuppoſition that any ſuch general agreement, univerſal underſtanding, or tacit conſent of all, obtains, in reſpect to our preſent ſubject.——In regard to thoſe who *receive* the Declaration the very reverſe is the caſe. So far are our venerable Prelates from requiring ſubſcription to the articles in ſome *new ſenſe*, different from their plain and expreſs meaning, that they ſeriouſly lament the departure from this mode of interpretation, and urgently recommend a return to it. This, it has been ſhown [p], is the undoubted conduct of ſeveral of the moſt active and eminent of theſe Prelates. Read a paſſage more, on the ſubject, from the Biſhop of Rocheſter. "You have no authority," his Lordſhip obſerves to his Clergy, "to preach any new-fangled opinions of your own.... You muſt ſtick cloſe to *the doctrine;* to the form of ſound words originally delivered to the Saints. You are to lay open the wonderful ſcheme of man's redemption. You are to lay it open in its intirety. You are to ſet it forth faithfully and exactly, as it is exhibited in the Holy Scriptures; and, upon the authority of the Scriptures in their plain, natural, unſophiſticated meaning, *in the Offices, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Homilies of the Church of Eng-*

(m) Sermon on Subſcription, p. 37. (n) Vol. ii. p. 68.
(o) Ibid. p. 57. (p) Ch. i. p. 36—43.

land. . . . In delivering the great myſterious truths of the Goſpel; and I repeat it, the whole Goſpel, with all its myſteries, muſt be preached in all congregations, I would adviſe you to uſe in general, not an argumentative, but a plain didactic ſtyle: teach with authority, not as the Scribes: upon the momentous doctrines of Man's corruption, of Chriſt's atonement, the gratuitous acceptance of Man's imperfect works in regard to Chriſt's merits, of the juſtification of man, of good works, (the preciſe ſubjects of this controverſy) *always adhering ſtrictly*, as I have before ſaid, to the Scriptures, the *Thirty-nine Articles*, and the *Homilies* [z]." Recollect the deciſive language of the Biſhop of Lincoln [y]. And eaſily might it be proved, that adherence to the plain and natural ſenſe of the eſtabliſhed Confeſſion is inculcated in the Charges of many other of theſe Dignitaries [q].——In regard to thoſe who *make* the Declaration, there are alſo certainly very great numbers who adhere to this obvious and primitive ſenſe, and who ſee not how they could conſcientiouſly ſubſcribe in any other.

This claſs of Miniſters our opponents themſelves deſcribe as "forming a conſiderable body [r];" "a conſiderable part of the Clergy [s];" as "numerous, active, united, and ſupported by opulent patrons;" as occupying "many livings in different counties of the kingdom, numerous chapels in populous towns, and a majority of the lectureſhips in London [t]." "I ſhall aſſume it as indiſputable," ſays a re-

(z) Charge, 1800, p. 31. (y) Above, p. 336. (q) This interpretation is enforced in the uſual Exhortations of the venerable Archbiſhop of York, to Candidates for Orders. It is alſo ſtrongly enforced by thoſe of our Prelates who recommend Nowell's Catechiſm, Jewell's Apology, Secker's Charges, &c. as illuſtrations of our Articles. (r) See the Critical Review for November, 1797, p. 289. (s) Ibid. for May, 1800, p. 18. (t) Antijacobin Review, April, 1799, p. 364. See alſo the Critical Review for June and July, 1800, p. 223, 334; and Mr. Haggitt's Sermon, Preface, p. 13. "The literal and grammatical ſenſe," Mr. Bingham obſerves, "is the ſenſe in which all churches commonly deſire their articles to be

ſpectable Miniſter, addreſſing his Clerical Brethern, "for the contrary ſuppoſition is too horrid to be admitted for a moment, that we receive the doctrines of our church, as contained in her articles, to which we have ſolemnly ſubſcribed; and as breathed in every page of our moſt excellent Liturgy, to which we have publicly pledged ourſelves to conform; that in our prayers and our diſcourſes, we ſpeak the ſame language, utter the ſame ſentiments, and are actuated by one and the ſame ſpirit[o]."

And, in regard to a *third party* which is certainly very intimately concerned in the buſineſs, there is no doubt but that nine perſons out of ten, who hear a Miniſter read the Articles with a declaration of his unfeigned aſſent to them, believe him ſincere, and to ſpeak according to the ordinary uſe of language. And ſo far is a diſcovery of the contrary from being univerſally aſſented to, and acquieſced in, by the laity, that for this avowed reaſon, becauſe they cannot hear her genuine doctrines[v], large bodies of his Majeſty's ſubjects, even by "half a million[w]" in a claſs, deſert the ſervice of our church, and frequent other places of Worſhip where they believe ſomething more like theſe doctrines is taught.——So weak is the defence of this new ſenſe of the Articles, on the ground that it is *univerſally agreed upon*, and *underſtood*, by thoſe whom the ſubject concerns.

The caſe of obſolete Acts of Parliament which Dr. Hey pleads[x], is not parallel to the caſe in queſtion. Theſe Acts are not conſtantly and ſolemnly read with declarations of unfeigned approbation of them; but are literally ſuffered to fall into *diſuſe*. The very reverſe is the treatment of the 39 Articles.

---

underſtood; and to underſtand them in any other ſenſe, is either to force unnatural interpretations upon plain words, or make nonſenſe of them." Apology, p. 96.

(o) See "a Diſcourſe delivered at the Viſita. of The Right Worſhipful Robert Markham, M. A." By John Lowe, M. A. p. 5.
(v) See Mr. Benſon's Vindication of the Methodiſts, p. 11, 12, &c,
(w) Antijacobin Review, Auguſt, 1799, p. 452. (x) Vol. ii. p. 55—60.

The argument deduced from the change which has taken place with regard to the *Habits* of Miniſters [y]; and from the phraſe repeated ſo often, "My Maſter is not at home [z];" the ſignature, "obedient, humble ſervant [a];" &c. [b]; is frivolous and pitiful. Does the truth of Chriſt wax old and change like the faſhion of our garments? Or is it a proper vindication of Jeſuitical caſuiſtry in his Miniſters in the ſolemn act of devotion to his ſervice, that a few complimentary lies are tolerated by the World?

The example of Geneva, which Dr. H. adduces, the Britiſh Critic is conſtrained to denominate "a flagrant violation of the laws of conſcience and morality, and even the religion of an oath, in its inmoſt ſanctuary [c]."——"In the modern Church of Geneva," Dr. H. ſays, "the moſt complete *tacit Reformation* ſeems to have taken place. Geneva was the metropolis of Calviniſm; Calvin himſelf taught there; and, after him, Beza; but the Geneveſe have now *in fact* quitted their Calviniſtic Doctrines, though in *form* they retain them.... When the Miniſter is admitted, *he takes an oath* of aſſent to the Scriptures, *and profeſſes* to teach them '*according to the Catechiſm of Calvin;*' but this laſt clauſe, about Calvin, he makes a ſeparate buſineſs; ſpeaking lower, or altering his poſture, or ſpeaking after a conſiderable interval. There ſeems ſtill to be ſome obligation to read public Lectures at Geneva on Calvin's Catechiſm, for the Lecturers propoſe a part of it as a ſubject or text; but then they immediately go off to ſomething elſe: they do not adhere to it, nor even treat of it. The Youth are chiefly taught Oſtervald's Catechiſm, which ſeems to contain what may now be called the *real* religion of Geneva [d]." "The multitude," however he ſays, "may poſſibly retain the Calviniſtic notions [e]." Yet after quoting the paſſage juſt noticed from Dr. Powell, "This ſhows," Dr. H. obſerves,

(y) Nor. Lect. Vol. II. p. 74. (z) Ibid. p. 63, 70, 12, &c. (a) Ibid. p. 71. Note. (b) Ibid. p. 62, &c. (c) May, 1800, p. 499. (d) Vol. II. p. 57. (e) Ibid. p. 73.

"how a Minister of the church of Geneva is now clear of the crime of prevarication [f]!"——What then, we ask this learned Professor, is prevarication? Or what great apology for this conduct in Christian Ministers is it, to be told, that "Amongst the ancient *pagans*, the Philosophers, or Initiated, had one religion, and the profanum vulgus another [g]?"

And what would not be the effects of the system in question, were it generally reduced to practice in the affairs of civil and common life? Dr. H. himself has supposed the objection which is inseparable from it, that it "seems calculated to perplex plain integrity, to entangle common sense, to confound truth with falsehood [h]." And, if, when, voluntarily, and after due time for examination, a man declares, that "*from his heart he acknowledges all the articles of our church, and every thing that is contained in them to be agreeable to the Word of God*, and engages to take them in their *literal sense*, and to put *no sense or comment of his own* upon them contrary to this interpretation," he is to be understood to mean, that *many* of these articles have now *no signification at all*, and that others in their plain and literal sense are *contrary to the word of God*, and are to be interpreted in a *new and different* sense, it must surely be inquired, how society is to understand his meaning, or to obtain security from him, in any other covenant? Must not such a scheme open a door to evasion that would, in effect, release men from every engagement that became unpleasant to them? Or would it not, at the best, occasion as great a confusion of language as that which attended the speculation to build a tower to heaven [i]?

But we need not depart from the case in hand to discover confusion enough. The true standard of interpretation, we are taught is, the present opinion of "the generality of learned and judicious men;" or "of those whom a minister

(f) Ibid. p. 68. (g) Ibid. p. 73. (h) Ibid. p. 55.
(i) Gen. xi. 1—9.

accounts the moſt judicious [k]." Let us then ſuppoſe this to be the caſe, and that for the ſake of being fully underſtood, and of preſerving ſome appearance of honeſty, every miniſter after reading the above declaration of aſſent, ſhould immediately avow this to be his meaning; what would not be his perplexity; and what a farce would not his ſubſcription be?

The learned and eminent Biſhop Watſon, the learned and judicious Archdeacon Balguy, the learned &c [l], he would find, are of opinion, that it is enough merely not to *contradict* the eſtabliſhed confeſſion in our inſtructions from the Pulpit.

The learned and judicious Archdeacon Paley, whoſe Work forms a part of the common reading at a great Univerſity, ſuppoſes, that the main end of our Articles, was the proſcription of certain ſects and tenets which obtained at their impoſition; and that neither the opinions of the Compilers, nor of our preſent Biſhops, are of any ſignification in the interpretation of theſe Articles, but that it is the *legiſlature of the 13th of Elizabeth* whoſe intention the ſubſcriber is bound to ſatisfy [m]. Other learned Divines and Critics approve of the Archdeacon's ſentiments [n].

The learned and reſpectable Mr. Giſborne maintains, that "It is the intention of the *preſent legiſlature*, whether that be or be not the ſame with the intention of the legiſlature of the 13th Elizabeth, which the ſubſcriber is bound to ſatisfy [o]."

The learned and judicious Archdeacon Powell, late Maſter of St. John's College, Cambridge; the learned and ingenious Dr. Hey, as Norriſian Profeſſor of Divinity in this Univerſity, with their diſciples, ſay a vaſt deal about ſome *new and acquired ſenſe* [p]. And this ſenſe, Dr. P. teaches, is neither fixed "by thoſe who require" ſubſcription, nor "by the Governors of the church," nor "by the legiſla-

(k) Above, p. 22—25. (l) Ibid. p. 18. (m) Ibid. p. 19—22. (n) Ibid. (o) Moral Phil. Ch. on Engagements. (p) Above, p. 22—26.

ture[q]." One claſs of Critics ſays "The meaning of the Articles is undoubtedly to be ſought from the *framers* of them[r]:" Another is very confident, that The *Dioceſan* is the only proper judge whoſe preaching ſhould be conſidered moſt conformable to the public ſtandard[s]. One body of learned and judicious Doctors adheres to the plain meaning of the Articles except on ſome *obſtruſe doctrines*[t]: Another, neither leſs learned nor leſs judicious, adheres to this interpretation *on all points*[v]! &c. &c.

If, however, amidſt this vaſt variety, a Candidate for Orders can determine which party to "account the moſt judicious;" in their ſenſe, he may, it ſeems, conſcientiouſly ſubſcribe our Articles. And thus will the church "*avoid diverſities of opinion*, and *eſtabliſh conſent* touching true religion!" Or rather, thus will a Miniſter's ſubſcription juſt prove that he can write his own name!

But neither can we reconcile ourſelves to the reſerve our opponents plead for, in reſpect to what they denominate the "*myſterious and difficult* doctrines[w]" of the Articles.——They do not clearly ſpecify their few general and fundamental principles of Chriſtian faith, which are clearly delivered, and uniformly believed by all[x]." Neither do they ſay preciſely, and uniformly, which are thoſe "unneceſſary," "doubtful, inaccurate, unphiloſophical," "too philoſophical," "erroneous," Articles, they would retrench and correct; and what are thoſe "abſtruſe queſtions," and "diſputable points," they would leave "to the free deciſion of every man's private judgment[y]." Some of them, however, it is clear, conſider every thing in the eſtabliſhed forms "myſterious and difficult," which they conceive borders on *Calviniſm*: Others find their difficulties in the doctrines of *Grace, Faith, and Juſtification*: A third party applies theſe epithets

(q) Dis. ii. p. 35. (r) Antijac. Reviewers, Jan. 1800, p. 19.
(s) Critical Reviewers, Nov. 1797, p. 291 (t) Above, p. 27—29.
(v) Ibid. p. 36—42; 333—335. (w) Above, p. 27—30.
(x) Ibid. (y) Ibid. p. 27—29.

to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*: And a fourth sees nothing but perplexity and difficulty in requiring subscription to *any Articles of faith*.

The whole tenour of their writings evinces the first of these particulars [z]. The quotations already adduced from the Drs. Bennet, Croft, &c, establish the second [a]. Professor Hey shall vouch for the next: "We and the *Socinians*," he affirms, "differ only about what we do *not understand*: and about what is to be done on the part of God [b]. And the last is proved by the whole purport of the Confessional, the Considerations of Bishop Law [c], and many passages in the Philosophy of Dr. Paley. "Bishop Law," Dr. Hey says, "does not seem to allow, that *any* case can justify requiring a declaration of opinion [d]."

To allow the Subscriber therefore to exercise a reserve and a latitude on all doctrines which he may please to call mysterious and difficult, is not even to distinguish him from a Socinian, or an enemy to all forms of doctrine, and is, in effect, requiring nothing of him.

"It is not indeed necessary," as the Bishop of Lincoln observes, "that he should approve *every word* or *expression*, but he ought to believe *all the fundamental doctrines* of the articles; *all those tenets in which our church differs from other churches*, or from *other sects* of Christians [e]." It is not necessary, in order to conscientious subscription, that our Divines should harmonize on every possible point of doctrine, but only upon those doctrines which are contained in our forms, and only upon *these* to the *extent* to which they are there plainly fixed and settled.

Nor is there any considerable difficulty in distinguishing between this sort of latitude, and that which is condemned. The one respects doctrines beyond the extent of the arti-

---

(z) See Ibid, Chap. 2. (a) Above, p. 33, 34; 204. (b) Vol. ii. p. 41. (c) On the propriety of requiring a subscription to Articles of faith. (d) Vol. ii. p. 133. (e) Elements, Vol. ii. p. 567.

cles, in respect to which they settle nothing: The other respects those doctrines which in their plain language they contain and establish. "A Father leaves his fortune to his Son, on condition that he should pay to an old Servant an annuity for life of fifty pounds a year:" But what would be thought of the Son's understanding or integrity, if, after he became possessed of the estate, he should raise difficulties and scruples, and attempt to evade the plain force of the condition, because it was not determined whether the annuity should be paid in *Bills* or in *Gold*, or because neither the *day* nor the *hour* of the day of payment was fixed? Must it not then be most unbecoming the character of Divines to suggest difficulties and to justify evasion on the subject in hand, by equally *frivolous* pretences? On our system there is, to honest minds, comparatively no difficulty. It bewilders men in none of these endless labyrinths: it requires none of this suspicious casuistry. All parties concerned are supposed to act in this case, as men of principle and understanding act on other occasions; to express their intention by their words, and to use words in their ordinary signification. The forms in question are therefore conceived to be at once expressive of the intention of the Compilers and original Imposers, and that of our present legislature and church-governors who continue them.——These forms, then, are the standard of doctrine; and their meaning must be ascertained by the ordinary rules of interpretation. And he only who believes the doctrines they plainly contain, can fairly and conscientiously subscribe them. "Thus only," Bishop Pretyman, after the passage just quoted from him, adds, "can a person offer himself at the table of the Lord as his Minister with safety; thus only can he expect to receive the divine blessing upon that course of life to which he then solemnly devotes himself."

But, if we have thus deliberately, solemnly, and repeatedly engaged to teach according to the plain doctrines of our established forms; if we are continually and earnestly ex-

horted to this conduct, by the most active and eminent of our Prelates; if it is what is generally expected from us by the laity; if we are bound to it by all the obligations that can bind us to "moral honesty;" and, if a contrary procedure is only capable of so paltry, so frivolous, so Jesuitical a defence; if it defeats the very end of subscription, introduces such confusion, appears so suspicious, so endangers sincerity, and is attended with such reproach to the established church, we have surely no mean reason, while ministers of this church, for adhering to these doctrines.—— Far however are we from considering these obligations any hardship upon us. For,

2. Secondly, we *very highly value* our established forms of doctrine and worship.——Dr. Croft will have it, that several of our articles lean towards *Enthusiasm*[f]. Other Doctors, though usually in terms less direct, manifest a similar opinion[g]. We appeal however to the *internal evidence* these articles afford, for a refutation of this charge. But what is this Ethusiasm about which we continually here so much? Why just, in Bishop Horne's style, what the imposer of the term "pleases to hate." If we take our idea of it from Paine[h], Hume[i], Lord Shaftsbury[k], and their disciples, it is only another name for Christianity. In the mouth of Dr. Priestley[l], Dr. Geddes[z], Mr. Belsham[m], and the admirers[n] of their system, it means every thing which distinguishes the doctrines of our church from Socinianism. Some, who would be thought orthodox, and even churchmen, include in their notion of it all pretensions in these

(f) Above, p. 29. (g) Ibid, p. 208, 209. (h) See The Age of Reason passim. (i) See his Essays and Dialogues. (k) Characteristics. (l) See his Writings passim. (z) Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures and Translation of the Bible. (m) See his Answer to Mr. Wilberforce. (n) See the Analytical Review for May, 1797, p. 509; the Critical Review for June, 1797, on the "Practical View," &c.

days to the Inſpiration of God's Holy Spirit[o]. Others conſider all perſons enthuſiaſts, who talk of Converſion and diſcriminating Sanctification among the profeſſors of Chriſtianity; who diſcover any conſiderable exerciſes of the Heart and Affections in religion; or in ſhort, who hold the neceſſity of any thing which can properly be called Chriſtian Experience[p].

The diſtinction between being a "Jew inwardly," and a "Jew only outwardly," this claſs of Divines will not inſiſt upon; and, as Biſhop Butler complains, "under the notion of a reaſonable religion," they deviſe one "ſo very reaſonable, as to have *nothing to do with the heart and affections*, if theſe words ſignify any thing but the faculty by which we diſcern ſpeculative truth[q]."——There are others, however, ſurely with the moſt expreſs deciſions of Scripture[r] on their ſide, who conceive, that every true Chriſtian is inſpired, enlightened, ſanctified, and comforted, by the Spirit of God. In their judgment therefore, enthuſiaſm conſiſts, not neceſſarily in the claim itſelf, but in an *unſupported* claim, to divine influence; not in holding the doctrine, but in wrong conceptions of the *nature* of it; in a ſuppoſition that the *manner* of the Holy Spirit's operations may be known, or in ſome unſcriptural methods of *expecting* or *aſcertaining* his ſuggeſtions and influence.

However great then the evil of Enthuſiaſm may be, we muſt not, it is manifeſt, too readily relinquiſh every doctrine that is branded with it: If we do, we muſt commence Deiſts, if not Atheiſts. It is a commodious term of reproach, by which, from the very time of the Apoſtles, perſons of no religion at all, and thoſe of cold and languid piety, have endeavoured to depreciate true and zealous

(o) Above, p. 124; Dr. Balguy's Ch. 1. p. 172. (p) Above, p. 113, 126. (q) Sermons at Roll's Chapel, 13, p. 262. (r) See e. g. John xiv. 16; Romans viii; 1 Corinth. ii.

Chriſtians. It is an imputation which the ungodly and profane are perfectly ſecure from, but which, from the very nature of Chriſtianity, may be eaſily faſtened, with ſome degree of plauſibility, on the pious and devout. "The character of a ſober Chriſtian," the excellent Biſhop Horne obſerves, "will always be in danger from two ſorts of people, the lukewarm, and the fanatic. With the latter ſort his piety will be lifeleſs and formal; and the former will brand him for an Enthuſiaſt: Thus it was, and thus it ever will be [s]."—"The Love of God," Biſhop Butler adds, "will every where by the generality of the world, be called Enthuſiaſm [n]." But, as this very ſenſible and diſpaſſionate Prelate alſo remarks, "A doctrine's having been a ſhelter for enthuſiaſm, is no proof of the falſity of it: Truth or right being ſomewhat real in itſelf, and ſo not to be judged of by its liableneſs to abuſe, or by its ſuppoſed diſtance from or nearneſs to error [t]."—It is the ſterling Coin which is counterfeited; but who on this account would deny its exiſtence or reject its uſe?—But to return to our appeal.

Enthuſiaſm, as on all hands it ſeems allowed, owes its fundamental ſupport to pride [v], to an over-weening opinion men entertain of themſelves, and an unwarranted conceit of their familiarity with God. The doctrines of our articles are wonderfully adapted to generate humility. The threatenings and promiſes, the awful and amiable attributes of the Supreme Being, are ſo intermixed and exhibited, as to excite that proper mixture of fear and hope, of reverence and confidence, which only belongs to genuine piety.

Enthuſiaſts reject or depreciate the uſe of reaſon, argument, learning, and other ordinary means of ſeeking after truth, in their religious inquiries [w]. In our articles we ſee

(s) On Enthuſiaſm. (n) Preface to Sermons, p. 33. See alſo the Sacred Writings; Andrews' on Grace; Milner's Hiſtory of the Church; &c. (t) Note q, and Sermon, p. 261. (v) Hey's Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 245; Locke on Human Underſtanding, Ch. on Enthuſiaſm; Hume's Eſſays; &c. (w) Nor. Lect. Vol. ii. p. 185; Locke; Hume; &c.

a most elaborate use of these means.——Enthusiasts account little of the plain duties of common life, and make religion to consist almost wholly in something of a more sublime and exalted nature [x]. Here every Christian man whatever, is declared "bound to obedience to the commandments of God, which are called moral;" and the relative duties are most minutely expounded, and urgently enforced.——Enthusiasts, of course, express themselves in language correspondent to their rapturous conceptions [y]. Here we find "the words of truth and soberness," and the strongest marks of thought, coolness, and moderation. "Caution and moderation," Bishop Pretyman, speaking of our Articles, says, "are no less conspicuous in them, than a thorough knowledge of the scriptures, and of the early opinions and practice of Christians [z].——Enthusiasts presume that they know the Will of God from their *own feelings* [a], that their emotions are inspired and are *therefore* good; and hence such feelings become the rule of their conduct. Here the very reverse method is pursued; the only standard of duty prescribed is the written Word of God; and we are called upon to judge of the cause by the effects, to examine whether our impressions and behaviour are correspondent to this rule, and *then* only to consider them good, and ascribe them to a divine influence [b].——And, to mention at once what Dr. Croft, Mr. Daubeny, and their class of Writers, appear chiefly to have in view, Enthusiasts, they tell us, ascribe so much to divine agency in the work of salvation, as to dispense with the necessity, or relax the motive, for human endeavours [c]. Here, it has been proved at large, the very contrary is the case; and the consideration, that "God worketh in us," is urged as a most powerful motive to our working "out our own salvation [d]."

(x) Hume; Review of Policy; &c. (y) Ibid. (z) Elements, Vol. ii. p. 35. (a) Hume, Locke, &c. (b) Above, p. 283—285. (c) See Croft's Strictures, p. 63, Daubeny's Guide, p. 375. Note; Dr. Carr's Sermons, i. p. 12. (d) See above, Ch. vii. §. 2.

Neither do we conceive it to be any solid objection to our forms that they contain doctrines that are *mysterious and difficult*.——Not to repeat any thing respecting the vagueness of these terms, if, it may here be observed, "some things hard to be understood [e]," were not to be found in our Articles, they could not be a just representation of the whole doctrines of scripture. And what subject is not attended with Difficulties? "Are there not," as the learned Bishop Stillingfleet observes, "mysteries in Arts, mysteries in nature, mysteries in Providence [f]?" But the gospel is professedly a Mystery; a mystery "which the Angels desire to look into [g];" a scheme of Grace and Mercy utterly unfathomable. We are told also expressly, that "now we see through a glass darkly;" and that here we only "know in part [h]." This indeed must be the case, from the nature of our present finite and imperfect faculties, and the nature of many subjects in religion.

Nor are any persons more ready than our opponents, when it suits their turn, to complain of "the little that is revealed to us, and the imperfect manner in which that little is revealed." When therefore we are called upon to "affix determined ideas to every word we use [i]" in our religious system; when, with an air of contemptuous superiority, it is said, "Explain to us what you *mean precisely* by justification, by spirit, by influence, by experience [k]:" these Gentlemen certainly demand more of us than they can do for themselves. Explain to us, we may retort, what *you mean precisely* by only *one* of these particulars, "by *Spirit*;" or if you like it better, by the *rational system* which rejects Divine

(e) 2 Peter, iii. 16. (f) On Scripture Mysteries, Oxford Encheirid. p. 350. (g) 1 Peter i. 12; 1 Tim. iii. 16. (h) 1 Cor. xiii. 9, 12. Lord Bacon denominates the whole period "from the Creation to the Dissolution of the world, the time of the *Mystery*:" Works, Vol. iv. p. 457. Our modern Geniuses can penetrate every thing. (i) See Dr. Balguy's 2d Ch. p. 191; and Mr. Ludlam's Writings. (k) Critical Review, Nov. 1797, on Ludlam.

influence: Show us precisely the "determined ideas" you affix only to the Word GOD: Point out to us, with precision, the connection between *Divine Prescience* and *Moral Agency*; or banish these notions from your system, and define it without them. An attempt of this kind would perhaps, to pursue their own language, "cut up to the roots," their vaunting pretensions to such a perfection of knowledge, and precision of Words.

A parade about *Definitions* is by no means that sovereign remedy for every difficulty on moral and religious subjects, which some persons would insinuate. "A Definition," as the admired Burke observes, "may be very exact, and yet go but a very little way towards informing us of the nature of the thing defined[l]." But the worst is, what is called a definition, is often neither a true representation of the thing defined, nor of what those who understand it best consider it, but only of the Writer's own arbitrary, partial, or limited view of it. Yet this, he presumes, warrants him to treat every other notion of a subject as inaccurate and absurd.

This is manifestly the conduct of Mr. Daubeny on the subject of faith[m]. This is the method of defining religion and morality adopted by Mr. Ludlam, when he "accuses Dr. Paley and *Dr. Johnson* of a want of precision in their ideas[n]" on these subjects! There is much propriety in the observation of the Antijacobin Reviewers on Mr. Ludlam's Work. "The propensity in some writers," they say, "to dwell upon elementary and verbal distinctions, we have always disapproved; especially when religion was the subject of their consideration: and Mr. Ludlam's fondness for Definition compels us to observe, that Christianity was not revealed to man so much for the purpose of exercising his understanding, as of influencing his affections, and regulating his conduct[o]." Let then the truths of religion be in-

(l) On the Sublime and Beautiful, Introduct. p. 5. (m) See above, p. 277, &c. (n) Six Essays, p. 114; and Antijacobin Review, for July, 1799, p. 282. (o) Antijac. Ibid.

veſtigated and aſcertained with the greateſt *poſſible* accuracy; but let not our forms of doctrine be diſparaged, becauſe they afford not mathematical clearneſs on ſubjects which do not admit of it; let not thoſe who declaim againſt myſteries, be conceived to hold a ſyſtem *free from difficulties*.

One claſs of the difficult doctrines of our Articles is ſuppoſed to ariſe from their *inclination to Calviniſm*. But it will be hard to prove that even this affords any proper ground of objection to theſe forms. Let not the reader be alarmed. We will not reaſon high

> "Of providence, foreknowledge, will and fate[p],
> Fixt fate, freewill, foreknowledge abſolute."

A few obſervations may however, perhaps, be properly and intelligibly ſubmitted to him. Is it then, we aſk, an unpardonable defect in the eſtabliſhed confeſſion, that it leaves in difficulty a queſtion, which, our opponents admit, "has been found hitherto to exceed all the ſkill of philoſophy[q];" a queſtion not originating in our forms of doctrine, nor even in Chriſtianity itſelf, but which exiſts with equal intricacy in natural religion, and is as old as the very origin of evil; a queſtion which, as it is affirmed, "being ſtrongly interwoven both with Philoſophy and Theology has in all ages thrown every ſchool and every church into inextricable doubt and perplexity[r]?" Is it ſo manifeſt an abſurdity as ſome perſons would inſinuate it to be, to *incline to one ſide* of a queſtion "upon ſubjects where," it is alſo admitted, "the moſt orthodox have admitted a latitude; where a Baſil and an Auguſtine would probably have diſſented from each other[s];" and where, neither the erroneouſneſs of this opinion nor the rectitude of the oppoſite one, can be more ſatisfactorily eſtabliſhed by either philoſophers or divines?

(p) Milton, B. 2. l. 558. (q) See Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 490. (r) Hume's England, Vol. vi. quarto, p. 273. (s) Britiſh Critic for January, 1796, p. 73.

But here, particularly, the objectors in queſtion betray inconſiſtency and unfairneſs. When they would ſilence Calviniſts, the queſtion is *utterly inexplicable*. It is in Mr. Daubeny's language, a ſubject "on which all human ſpeculations are unprofitable[t]." He ſees "no good purpoſe that can be anſwered by any diſcuſſion on the ſubject[v]." He is therefore "contented to contemplate in reverential *ſilence*, a ſubject, which," he ſays, "I find myſelf incompetent to explain[w]." But, in fact, this reverential ſilence means large diſcuſſions in ſeveral volumes on the ſubject, a full liberty to ſay all he can on one ſide of the queſtion, and loud abuſe of all who differ from him upon it. This profeſſed incompetency is, in fact, a ſuppoſed ability to ſhow exactly where perſons of the greateſt eminence are wrong on the ſubject, with as much confidence of deciſion as if he had both "known the mind of the Lord, and been his counſellor[x]."

The ſame objection ſeems, in ſome degree, applicable to the reaſoning of a very learned Prelate on the ſubject. Having, in oppoſition to the Calviniſts, repreſented Predeſtination as founded on *foreſeen obedience*, "This," his Lordſhip ſays, "appears to me the only ſenſe in which predeſtination is *reconcileable with the attributes of God, and the free agency of man*[y]." Yet, only two pages afterwards, he ſays, "We are UTTERLY INCAPABLE OF COMPREHENDING how God's preſcience conſiſts with the other attributes of the Deity, and with the free-agency of man; nor can we conceive how thoſe future contingencies, which depend upon the determination of the human Will, ſhould be certain and infallible; and yet, that they are ſo, is fully proved by the accurate accompliſhment of propheſies."

But if Arminian Writers are thus *utterly incapable* of reconciling theſe difficulties, what force is there in the argu-

(t) Appendix, p. 5. (v) Ibid. p. 186. (w) Ibid. p. 190.
(x) See his Guide, Appendix, and Letter to Mrs. More, paſſim.
(y) See Biſhop Pretyman's Elem. of Theology, Vol. ii. p. 300.

ment which is only founded in the ſuppoſition that they *have* reconciled them? Is not all this a full confeſſion that, for any thing they know to the contrary, the Calviniſtic notion is as probably right as their own?

But to proceed a ſtep further: Does it not ſeem more ſafe, and more becoming, in a conteſt between the ſovereignty of God and the powers of man, to make the abatement on man's part than on God's? Whatever difficulties our ignorance may occaſion in the particular application of them, whatever abſurdities a *partial*, a *perverted*, or an *over-extended* view of the ſubject may preſent, the *fundamental* principles on which the Calviniſtic ſyſtem reſts, are incontrovertible. Had not the Glorious Being who created the world, a right to create it for what purpoſes he pleaſed? And has he not the ſame right to govern his own world according to his pleaſure? And if his perfections are infinite, muſt he not act in conformity to theſe perfections; and muſt not his purpoſes be aſſuredly accompliſhed; and muſt not all creatures, in one way or another, be the means of their accompliſhment? Is not his "the kingdom, the power, and the glory?" Has he not told us, that "His kingdom ruleth over all [z];" that he "worketh all things after the counſel of his own Will [a];" that "he doeth according to his Will in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth;" and, that "none can ſtay his hand, or ſay unto him, what doeſt thou [b]?"

And what ſcheme does ſo much honour to the character and government of the Supreme Being as that which repreſents him as aiming continually at the manifeſtation of his own glorious perfections, and the greateſt poſſible ultimate felicity of his creatures; as accompliſhing theſe ends by means concerted in wiſdom and goodneſs; permitting *partial* evil, in order to greater good; leaving his intelligent creatures to be influenced by motives which are certain in their effects, but which deſtroy not the moral reſponſibility

(z) Pſalm, 103. 19. (a) Ephes. i. 11. (b) Dan. iv. 35.

of the Agent[c]? What view of things is so pregnant with consolation to every truly godly man? What unworthy conceptions must they entertain of their Maker, who would not choose that their own condition and that of the universe should depend upon the Will of God rather than the Will of Man? Yet hence originates the whole objection we are combating.

There are persons however who conceive that a Being possessed of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, must manage all things much better than they themselves, or any of his creatures, could do. The language of their hearts therefore is, "The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice[d]." "Alleluia, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth[e]." These persons repress at once their objections to the Divine procedure, and their anxieties under it, with the consideration, that he is "GOD[f];" and that although "Clouds and darkness are round about him;" yet, that "righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne[g]."

And what system, it may be further inquired, so harmonizes with Experience; with God's sovereign and unequal distribution of strength, health, parts, religious privileges, and other blessings in this life? What other notions are so illustrated and confirmed in his whole dealings with Adam, Abraham, Joseph, Moses, the nation of the Jews, and all whose history is recorded in the Bible?

That, however, upon which we would particularly rest our vindication of this part of the established forms, is, their *moderation*, *caution*, and *modest acquiescence in the plain letter of Scripture*, on these deep points[h]. They decide not,

---

(c) See Bishop Horne's Sermon on Samuel ii. 30; Dr. Blair's on Psalm lxxvi. 10; and the Writings of Edwards, Bellamy, Leibnitz, &c. (d) Psalm xcvii. 1. (e) Revelations xix. 6. (f) Psalm xlvi. 10. (g) Psalm xcvii. 2. (h) See above, p. 93—95. "Those that are truly pious," saith Mr. Boyle, "whether *Calvinists* or Remonstrants, are perhaps more esteemed by God Almighty, than by one another; the one thinking to magnify his goodness, and the other contending to secure

where the Word of God is not deciſive. They do not, as is too commonly the caſe, annihilate one claſs of texts, to eſtabliſh the apparent doctrine of others; but proceed on a plan, which does equal juſtice to *every part* of God's Word on the ſubject. They equally extol Grace, and reprobate licentiouſneſs; and ſo treat of Divine Agency and of Human, as to ſecure the whole glory of our ſalvation to God, and yet to afford as ſtrong motives to human exertions, as if it depended wholly on ourſelves[1]. And yet it is impoſſible to convict them of inconſiſtency. No ſyſtem of Grace can therefore be adjuſted more wiſely; none is more adapted for exalting the Creator, humbling the creature, and promoting every ſpecies of piety and virtue.

---

the credit of his juſtice. Yet in honouring his goodneſs, both parties ſeem rivals; the one thinking it moſt celebrated, by allowing it irreſiſtible, to whom happineſs was deſigned; and the other thinking it univerſal, and that every body may be happy if he pleaſes; the one aſſigning free-grace an unlimited extent, and the other aſcribing it an infallible victorious degree. But not to enter upon theſe controverſies, ... it is ſo evident, that God is the author of man's felicity, that the diſpute is not ſo much about the thing as the manner of its being profered." Theol. Works, Vol. iii. p. 443.——"I confeſs," ſays Biſhop Horſley, "I cannot underſtand, upon what principle our brethren of the Calviniſtic perſuaſion ſhould demand of us, that we ſhould adopt either the reſolutions of the Synod of Dort, or what are called the Lambeth Articles, as the neceſſary expoſition of the Articles of our Church. But I as little underſtand, upon what principle our Arminian brethren ſhould inſiſt, that we ſhould ſet forth their opinions, as if they were aſſerted in our Articles, in their true and plain meaning, in condemnation of the Calviniſtic..... The opinions of Auſtin, which are the baſis of Calviniſm, have had their ſtrenuous aſſerters in the Church of Rome itſelf. Indeed, for a long time, they were the prevailing opinions of the Latin Church. Among us, Archbiſhop Laud was an Arminian; as *ſince* his time many other good ſervants of God, bright ornaments and luminaries of our Church, have been. But if we would look for warm advocates of Church-authority in general, and for *able writers in defence of our own form of Church-Government in particular,* ſuch we ſhall find among thoſe Divines of our Church, who were called, in their day, the *Doctrinal Calviniſts.*" Charge, 1800, p. 34. (i) See above, Ch. 7.

But, that our forms of doctrine ſhould incline toward Enthuſiaſm, and be otherwiſe pregnant with defects, is, it ſeems, a thing to be expected from the *circumſtances of the times* under which they were prepared. "That the articles concerning grace, faith, and good works, lean towards the ſide of enthuſiaſm," Dr. Croft ſays, "is neither to be condemned nor wondered at. The errors to which they were oppoſed will at once explain and juſtify ſuch language[k]." "The Clergy in Eliza's golden days," Mr. Polwhele adds, "were irradiated by a ſpecies of light which generated obſcurity..... Their ſophiſtry was worſe than ignorance[l]." And the common mode of evading the ſenſe, or depreciating the value of theſe forms is, to inſinuate ſomething about their oppoſition to popery, the comparative darkneſs of the age, and other manifold diſadvantages which the authors of them laboured under[m].

But were the errors of the Church of Rome of ſuch a nature that doctrines verging towards enthuſiaſm formed an antitheſis to them, and were a proper antidote againſt them? Who knows not that enthuſiaſm was a moſt prevalent error of that Church? Where, among the wildeſt reveries of any who have ſeparated from her, ſhall we find more frequent pretenſions to viſions, dreams, miracles, extaſies, extraordinary revelations, and all thoſe extravagancies of the imagination which conſtitute the very ſoul of enthuſiaſm? It was by theſe that the greateſt part of her monaſtic eſtabliſhments were firſt founded; by theſe her other enormities were chiefly ſupported. And what but the very eſſence of enthuſiaſm were her extravagant notions reſpecting mediators, merits, indulgences, and ſupererogations, to which the articles in queſtion are immediately oppoſed[n]? Even that part of her communion

(k) Bamp. Lect. p. 110. (l) Eſſay on the comparative Learning and Morality of the Ancients and Moderns, p. 247. (m) See Ch. 1. §. 1. 2; Biſhop Law's Theory, p. 247; &c. (n) See Moſheim's Tranſlator, Appendix, Vol. iii. p. 395.

among whom the chief relics of piety appeared to ſubſiſt at the time of the reformation, Dr. Moſheim tells us [o], were the Myſtics, a ſpecies of notorious Enthuſiaſts.

Mr. Hume indeed, to afford an opportunity of preferring this charge of Enthuſiaſm againſt the Reformers, has choſen to diſtinguiſh the errors of the Romiſh Church by the name of Superſtition, and has thus ſet theſe couſin-germans in direct oppoſition to each other. "While abſurd rites, and burdenſome ſuperſtitions," he ſays, "reigned in the Romiſh Church, the Reformers were thrown by a *Spirit of oppoſition*, into an enthuſiaſtic ſtrain of devotion [p]." With a conſiſtency, however, peculiar to falſehood, in other places he has been conſtrained to confeſs the truth, and has affirmed reſpecting the reformation that "no innovation was admitted merely from ſpite and *oppoſition* to former uſage;" but that, "it preſerved itſelf in that *happy medium* which wiſe men have always ſought, and which the people have ſo ſeldom been able to maintain [q]."

According to Biſhop Pretyman, "Dean Tucker has ſhown, in his Letters to Dr. Kippis, that at the time juſt preceding the Reformation, the Church of Rome, in reſpect to predeſtination, grace, free-will, and perſeverance, was truly Calviniſtical [r]." How then would leaning to Calviniſm, or aſcribing too much to Divine agency, which is what our opponents chiefly mean by enthuſiaſm, counteract this doctrine? Nor would the temptation to incline to the calviniſtic ſide of the queſtion be greater, if, according to another repreſentation, it was a leading object with the founders of our Church to guard againſt the Calviniſm of certain ſeparatiſts from Rome. But, as we have largely ſhown above [s], view the matter in what light they pleaſe, there is no proper ground for this leaning conceit. The

(o) Eccles. Hiſt. Vol. iii. p. 301. (p) Hiſt. of England under Henry VIII. (q) Ibid. Vol. v, p. 149. (r) Elements, Vol. ii. p. 316. (s) Page 48—54.

ſituation of our Reformers, in this reſpect, was favourable to moderation and truth. And the complaints of oppoſite parties, the one that they ſtopped ſhort, and the other that they proceeded too far [t], is an argument, among many others, that they actually obſerved the proper bounds; and that they were neither a kind of half Papiſts themſelves, nor hurried into the contrary extreme by their oppoſition to Popery.

But with what juſtice do modern Divines claim ſuch mighty advantages over the founders of our Church in regard to *knowledge?* "The conceit of ſuperior learning," Biſhop Horne obſerves, "has always had an ill effect upon Chriſtianity; and is frequently found in thoſe who have no great matters to value themſelves upon [v]." And never perhaps was it more neceſſary to guard againſt ſuch a conceit than in the preſent times. Never ſurely did "philoſophy falſely ſo called," produce effects more deplorable than thoſe which we have witneſſed.

There is then great reaſon to believe that the ſuperiority in queſtion is founded far more in conceit than in fact. Hear the evidence of a whole body of thoſe whom on other points we have called our opponents. "I hope," Dr. Balguy ſays, in anſwer to the ſuggeſtion "that our preſent articles impoſe upon us the doctrines of dark and ignorant ages," "they do not ſpeak of the times of the Reformation. The Age of Ridley, and Jewel, and Hooker will be reverenced by the lateſt poſterity [w]."

"Dr. Rennell," proceeds the Antijacobin Review, "juſtly queſtions that claim to pre-eminence which modern philoſophers arrogate to themſelves over their predeceſſors." "In compaſs and command of language," ſays the Doctor, "in ſimplicity and energy of diction, in orderly

(t) See above Ibid; Bingham's Apology, B. ii. Ch. xiii. p. 98—100; Dr. Hey's Nor. Lect. paſſim. (v) Charge, 1792, p. 8.
(w) Charge v. p. 271.

and comprehenſive thought, in profoundneſs of learning, and in the detail of accurate and patient inveſtigation, I cannot help thinking that we ſhould be unwiſe in conteſting the ſuperiority [x]." He then adduces from the age in queſtion, as eminent inſtances both of learning and piety, Hooker, Bacon, and Clarendon.

"We are not inclined to diſſemble," continues the Britiſh Critic, "that the ſtudy of theology has appeared to us, for many years paſt, to have greatly declined. It is with regret we aſſert, that neither in the method purſued, or in the induſtry exerted, have we in general been able to diſcern that ſound, manly, and matured excellence, which diſtinguiſhes thoſe Divines, who, from the period of the Reformation, to the middle of the preſent century, adorned not only the Church to which they belonged, but even the language and literature of their country [y]."——Among the exceptions from this charge, we ſee the moſt honourable mention of thoſe whoſe ſyſtem we defend.

Dr. Hawkſworth deſcribes the character of the Scholars of the preſent age thus: "Flumina libant ſumma leves." They "ſeem," he ſays, "to be *ſuperficially* acquainted with a multitude of ſubjects, but to go to the bottom of very few. This appears in criticiſm and polite learning, as well as in the abſtruſer ſciences: by the diffuſion of knowledge its depth is abated [z]."

And only to add the opinion of the learned Dr. Hey: Speaking concerning the propriety of "a new Verſion of the Scriptures," being attempted, "I fear," he ſays, "there is ſcarce a ſufficient fund of ſacred *Literature* amongſt us, juſt at preſent; we are apt to view things *ſuperficially*; nor perhaps is there a zeal for Religion ſufficiently ſtrong and ſteady. The 17th Century was *more learned* than the

(x) See his Commencement Sermon at Cambridge, July, 1798, and the Antijac. Review for October, 1799, p. 131. (y) For Nov. 1799, p. 496. (z) Adventurer, No. 49.

preſent [a]." And again, "It ſeems ſufficiently clear," he ſays, "that the perſons, who compiled our Articles, were men of the *firſt ability:* as *ſcholars* (if we except a few, though mere linguiſts ought not to be reckoned) we are MERE CHILDREN to them [b]."——But, is all this *true?* How unſufferable then is the arrogance of modern boaſters!

The true characteriſtic difference of the two periods ſeems to be, that learning is now more generally diffuſed. We have a far greater number of ſcholars; and the ſame perſons often poſſeſs more general knowledge, than was formerly uſual. But the firſt of theſe circumſtances would give us little advantage over Elizabeth's learned Divines in forming a Creed, as their number was certainly as great as could be uſeful in this work; and the other circumſtance will generally, and almoſt neceſſarily, render our knowledge more ſuperficial. Few minds are capable of entering fully into ſo many ſubjects; and perhaps the commonneſs of learning, or of ſomething which paſſes for it, may leſſen the ſtimulus for exploring its depths.

We have alſo, doubtleſs, made *particular* improvements. We are improved, it may be, by our controverſies with Infidels, in the manner of ſtating the Evidences of Chriſtianity; but this ſubject enters not into the preſent debate. Great light has been thrown upon particular parts and paſſages of Scripture by the learned labours of Lowth, Horſley, Hurd, Kennicott, and others; but the wiſeſt of theſe great biblical Scholars will not pretend that their diſcoveries affect any fundamental truth. Nay, "The worſt manuſcript extant," it is admitted, "would not pervert *one article* of our faith, or deſtroy *one moral* precept [c]."

We have moreover the additional light of a Newton in mathematics, and a Locke in metaphyſics; but Ridley, Taylor, and other leaders of our reformation, had a ſufficient

(a) Vol. i. p. 62. (b) Ibid. Vol. ii. p. 204. (c) Dr. Powell's Diſcourſes, p. 65; and Dr. Hey's Nor. Lect. Vol. i. p. 46.

acquaintance with these subjects for every theological purpose; and in Logic and Ecclesiastical History, and especially in familiarity with the Scriptures, few perhaps will contend, that they did not greatly excel us. "The Scriptures," Dr. Hey, speaking immediately of the Compilers of our Articles, says, "they were conversant in to a degree, of which few now have any conception [d]." One striking instance of this is, that Ridley, and some others of them, we are assured, "got by heart almost all the Epistles in Greek [e]."

Nor are the *Reasons* of their superiority in these respects wanting. Their attention was roused to the subject, in a manner ours is not, by the peculiarity of their circumstances. The Reformation was an event of great magnitude, and "set all men on thinking for themselves." Theology was at that time connected with every thing important in this Nation, and in Europe. Men's understandings therefore "by reason of use," became more dextrous at discerning between good and evil. Their *all* oftentimes depending on the issue of their theological contests, induced them to examine the real strength of every argument, and to investigate every question to the bottom.

Those also of our Reformers who suffered six years banishment, made it a season of extraordinary improvement in Divinity. "They came forth," Mr. Strype informs us, "out of exile and affliction, eminent for the integrity of their lives, the gravity of their behaviour, and the greatness of their spirits; and finally, for their diligent search and accurate knowledge of Scripture, Councils, Orthodox Fathers, and all ecclesiastical Antiquity [f]." Our motives to such an application to these subjects have been less urgent. It is no wonder therefore if our knowledge of them is less perfect. What troops are equally nerved in the time of peace as in

(d) Nor. Lect. Vol. ii, p. 204. (e) See Rolt's Lives of the Reformers, p. 305; and Fox, p. 434; and Ridley's farewel Letter with Coverdale, p. 72. (f) See Strype's Annals under 1559, p. 106.

that of War? And what but much active service in the field completes the Warrior?

Even that circumstance about which we hear so much, that our reformers lived two hundred years before us, if noticed at all, may be considered as a circumstance in their favour; as it places them so much nearer the fountain and first origin of Christianity.——In subjects of human science which depend on Experience for their perfection, new discoveries may be expected through the aid of time, and a progressive improvement. But in matters of revelation and fact, the very contrary is, in many respects, the case, and the advantage, in regard to the knowledge of them *decreases* in proportion to our distance from the time of their reputed origin. A revelation of the Will of God is, doubtless, *perfect at first*; and the highest improvement of which it is capable by any future ages, is a perfect comprehension of what was at first delivered. For as we read in Jewell, "Hæc ratio, inquit antiquissimus Pater Tertullianus, valet adversus omnes hæreses: Id esse verum, quodcunque primum: id esse adulterum, quodcunque posterius[g]." And "certain it is," Dr. Rennell observes, "that the channels by which the knowledge of religion was communicated, are neither so numerous or abundant as in the days of our fathers[h]."

Some persons indeed will have it, that our philosophical improvements give us an advantage as interpreters of Revelation, both over the primitive Christians, and the Apostles themselves[i]. But surely the whole notion is infinitely absurd. For, to omit other observations, "How," as Dr. Powell[z] incontrovertibly argues, "can the discoveries peculiar to Philosophers be of such importance for understanding a Book neither written by Philosophers nor addres-

(g) Apol. p. 156. Edit. 1692. (h) Commencement Sermon, as above. (i) See Bishop Law's Theory, &c. p. 144—149.
(z) Yet "Dr. Powell," Professor Hey says, "had as good pretensions to the character of a Philosopher as any man," Vol. ii. p. 263.

ſed to them? "The right interpretation of any Book," he obſerves, "is the diſcovery of the thoughts which the author intended to convey. But an author cannot intend to convey thoughts which were never in his own mind. And the firſt preachers of Chriſtianity, being no philoſophers, could not entertain notions *peculiar to philoſophers*. The one among them who had ſome acquaintance with Grecian literature, expreſsly diſavows, in the name both of himſelf and his fellow labourers, all human wiſdom. But had they been verſed in the learning of their own times, ſtill *every later diſcovery* muſt be foreign from their ideas, and *uſeleſs in explaining them* [k]."

And it is highly worthy of remark, as the Dr. proceeds to obſerve, that "the great leader of all our modern diſcoveries, the ſagacious and comprehenſive Lord Bacon, formed no expectations in the behalf of religion or philoſophy, of any improvements to be made in either, by the aſſiſtance of the other; but foreſaw the miſchiefs they would mutually receive from an improper alliance." I have digreſſed, his Lordſhip ſays, in his Review of all parts of learning, to Divine Philoſophy, "becauſe of the extreme prejudice which both religion and philoſophy have received, and may receive, by being commixed together; as that which undoubtedly will make an heretical religion, and an imaginary and fabulous philoſophy [l]." But Dr. Powell and Lord Bacon were perhaps enthuſiaſtic railers againſt all learning.

Let it be remembered then, that the reign of Elizabeth, when our Church was founded, and her genuine doctrines flouriſhed, has ever been celebrated as one of our moſt ſplendid literary periods, and for the depth of its erudition, has been ſtyled an "Auguſtan period;" and that the leading Divines of that age ſhrink not from a competition with the brighteſt ornaments of the preſent day. If however any think it more juſt, let our literary ſuperiority be admitted; but let thoſe who, on this account, would diſparage the

(k) Third Charge, p. 339. (l) Ibid.

eſtabliſhed Confeſſion, point out to us the connection between our modern improvements in ſcience, and their new doctrines in theology.

But the *manner* in which our forms of doctrine and worſhip were prepared alſo gives them a high claim to our reſpect. Not only was the age which produced them diſtinguiſhed for its learning and intelligence, but nearly the whole of this erudition and wiſdom was collected and exerted on the occaſion. A number of the moſt learned and pious Biſhops, the moſt eminent Divines, and all the principal perſons in the nation, were concerned in the buſineſs. Every aid was alſo borrowed from the labours and judgment of the moſt celebrated foreign Divines [m]. In ſhort, as the Antijacobins well expreſs it, "they ſummoned" for the purpoſe, "all the wiſdom, learning, and integrity, of which the world was then poſſeſſed [n]." The opinions, reaſonings, and objections of all perſons thus concerned, were brought together, compared, and examined, with great coolneſs and ſerioufneſs. Every particular in the work was proceeded upon ſtep by ſtep; former ſyſtems of faith and forms of worſhip were conſulted; and nothing was retained but what appeared of importance, and the wiſeſt and the beſt, after the cloſeſt examination and fulleſt diſcuſſion. And ſuch was the unuſual precaution uſed in the buſineſs, that when the Articles were ſubſcribed, they regiſtered both the number of pages, and the lines in each page [o].

Nor was this, as ſome would inſinuate, the immature work of a moment, effected "at the firſt dawn of the Reformation," before the full light of truth could be expected to have ariſen. From the commencement of Lutheraniſm, which firſt turned the attention of men to theſe ſubjects, to the regular commencement of the Reformation here, a pe-

(m) Burnet's Hiſtory, Vol. ii. p. 93, 155, 168, 385, 392, 405; Strype's Life of Cranmer, p. 273; and Life of Parker, p. 122.
(n) Review for October, 1799, p. 131. (o) Burnet and Strype as above, and paſſim.

riod elapsed of near forty years [p]. And from the first formation of our Articles under Edward the Sixth, to the time when they were finally settled, and received their parliamentary authority under Elizabeth, there was another period of near twenty years. So that, in fact, they contain the doctrines of the Reformation matured by the experience and discussions of half a Century. But during the whole of the latter period of time, these doctrines underwent the most laborious investigation by our Reformers; and Cranmer and other leading persons among them had solicitously meditated the great Work, and been industriously preparing for it long before [q].

But the *Characters* of the chief Agents in the formation of our national Confession, in other respects, deserve to be noticed.——"They were not," Dr. Hey observes, "mere scholars, nor monks, nor monkish men; but skilled in government; knowing men and manners; liberal in behaviour; free from all fanaticism; full of probity, yet guided in their measures by prudence [r]." They possessed not only the advantages already ascribed to them of first talents, liberal education, and unusual knowledge of the scriptures, but what, in Mr. Locke's opinion [s], is far more rare, and yet of more importance in order to the discovery of truth; namely, a sincere love of it. At least, they gave the greatest evidence of this disposition, that men *can* give. They believed, contrary to many modern teachers, that right theological sentiments are of the utmost importance to mankind. They exerted themselves therefore to the utmost to discover truth; and when in their own consciences they believed that they had discovered it, no sacrifice, not even that of life itself, could induce them to conceal it, to prevaricate respecting it, or in the slightest degree to depart from it [t]. Men therefore of such probity, of such piety, were not only very likely to discover truth, but would also certainly make

(p) See Mosheim; &c. (q) See Strype, Burnet, &c. as above, and passim. (r) Vol. ii. p. 204. (s) See Essay on the Understanding. Ch. on Enthusiasm, B. 4. p. 316. Ed. 13.

a faithful repreſentation of it to others. They could have no motive for ſo earneſtly inculcating what they did, but their ſtedfaſt perſuaſion of its truth and importance. They were indeed *men*, and had therefore, doubtleſs, their imperfections; but this conſideration gives us no advantage over them, becauſe we are *men* too.

Upon the whole then, to adopt the words of Dr. Hey again, "No ſet of men could be choſen, nor any circumſtances, more likely to form a good ſet of Articles [v]." Whether we attend to the Age in which our Reformers lived; to the ſituation in which they were placed, and their motives to exertion; to their actual literary and theological attainments; to the number of them that were united, and the immenſe pains they beſtowed, in their great work; or, to the proofs of diſintereſtedneſs and genuine piety they exhibited, we cannot but think them *entitled to the very higheſt reſpect as Interpreters of Scripture.* We know no contrary ſyſtem of doctrine upon which any ſuch degree of intellect, learning, labour, caution, ingenuouſneſs, and unqueſtionable virtue, has been united and exerciſed.

3. To proceed however one ſtep further on the point, as far as we are capable of judging for ourſelves, we conceive that our eſtabliſhed forms *exhibit the plain and genuine doctrines of the Scriptures*

A ſtrong preſumption of this, we think, is, that they who evade the plain meaning, and preſent application of theſe forms, do preciſely the ſame in reſpect to the meaning and application of Scripture. Thus, Dr. Prieſtley, Mr. Belſham, and others of their principles, who reject the *whole ſyſtem* of doctrines peculiar to our Articles, reject equally *whole paſſages* and *whole Books* of the ſacred Scriptures, or leſſen their force by telling us, that the Writers of the New Teſtament "were *fallible*, and liable to *miſtake*;" "that ſome texts of the Old Teſtament have been improperly quoted by Writers in the New;" that

(t) See their Biographers paſſim. (v) Vol. ii. p. 205.

they were "misled by Jewish prejudices," and "must not in *all* cases be trusted too implicitly [w]!"

Dr. Paley, and his large class of disciples, who conceive that the main object of our Articles was to guard against the errors of the Papists and Puritans and other Sects at the time of the Reformation, and that they are now in a great degree *unmeaning and obsolete*; in precisely the same manner, confine the application of large portions of the New Testament to the circumstances of the Jews and Gentiles at the first commencement of Christianity, and consider them in respect to us, as *perfectly unmeaning* [x]. In this way, they say, we must restrain the use of the terms, "elect," "called," "saints," being "in Christ;" &c. "The application of such phrases to the whole body of Christians," they teach, "is become now obscure;" and that "the application of them to distinguish the professors of Christianity from one another" is absurd. So also the phrases "regeneration," "born again of God and of the Spirit," "dead to sin," and "alive from the dead," "a new creature," "new creation," being made "sons of God," from "children of wrath," "freed from sin," and "from death," and all the passages of similar import with which the Word of God abounds, they confine wholly to the first conversion of the Jews and Gentiles to the profession of our religion. "Such expressions of scripture," they say, now "mean nothing, nothing, that is, to us, nothing to be found, or sought for in the present circumstances of Christianity [y]."

Those who labour to evade the plain sense of the Articles on *some particular points*, do on these points especially attempt to tamper with the Scriptures. Thus, Mr. Daubeny conceives, that the texts which relate to Predestination

(w) See Dr. Priestley's Letters to Dr. Price, and to Mr. Burn; and his history of the Corruption of Christianity; Belsham's Letters to Mr. Wilberforce; Dr. Hey's Nor. Lect. Vol. ii. p. 262; and Fuller's Systems compared, Letter 12. (x) See above, p. 115—118. (y) Ibid; and Dr. Paley's Visitation Sermon passim.

are interpreted "too literally," and would not have them to be so "strictly and philosophically inquired into[z]." Mr. Ludlam, who differs from the Church on the subjects of Original Sin, Justification, Atonement, the teaching of the Spirit, and communion with God[o], evades the plain force of Scripture on such subjects, by considering it as the phraseology of the Jewish dispensation introduced into Christianity, and by almost blaming our Lord himself for dealing so much in figures.

Thus when St. Paul affirms, "that the Ephesians were BY NATURE the children of wrath;" according to Mr. L., "the word nature must be understood in a figurative or metaphorical sense; and the Apostle only means by this expression to point out the very general prevalence of wickedness amongst the Ephesians;" he means, that this wickedness is as CONTRARY TO THEIR NATURE as "the size and form of dwarfs and deformed persons" are to "the natural stature and shape of mankind[m]!!"—And, speaking of the times of the Gospel, "A phraseology," he says, "appropriate to the Jewish dispensation from being literally applied, was now to be understood in a more extensive and translatitious sense. Nor is it to be wondered at, that persons, inured by custom and attached by principle to the old establishment, should carry a mode of speaking so familiar to them into that very different œconomy which was to take place. The various circumstances of the Jewish na-

(z) Appen. p. 225. (o) See this fully proved above. Yet Mr. L. can coolly say, "Every conscientious man, one would think, would hold himself bound to abide by the rules, and practices of that church, into whose service he has voluntarily entered, and whose emoluments he makes no scruple to take; or if he finds that he cannot conscientiously comply with them, would quit both the pay and the service of that church, and engage in one more to his mind; just as a man would quit a society, whose opinions he engaged to maintain, if he afterwards found he could not do so, consistent with his duty."——This is truly displaying the philosopher! The reason of an ordinary person would be a little confounded under such circumstances. (m) Six Essays, p. 80—90.

tion ſuggeſted ideas which can no longer obtain [a]." And, reprobating the frequent uſe of metaphors in Divinity, "Perhaps," he ſays, "a figurative way of ſpeaking uſed by our Lord himſelf may have given riſe to an opinion which ſo ſtrongly and ſo extenſively divides the Chriſtian world at this day [b]." We, however, ſhall be content to be humble imitators of our Lord and his Apoſtles, and ſhall leave Mr. L. the unrivalled merit of improving upon them.

Dr. Hey, who makes ſo perfect "a noſe of wax" of the Articles which aſcribe our *Salvation to Grace*, does preciſely the ſame with the Word of God on this ſubject. He does "not conceive, that we have, in Scripture, any Theory of what is called the doctrine of Grace [c]." The paſſages by which this doctrine is uſually ſupported, are not, he maintains, "for the ſake of truth or ſpeculation [d]," or intended "to teach any thing [e];" but are mere "expreſſions of ſentiment," of "eloquence," of "formality and decorum [f]," of "compliment [g]." They are, as the Dr. conceives, "popular, paſſionate expreſſions [h]," not to be uſed "in a literal, philoſophical, ſcientifical ſenſe [i];" but in ſenſes which are "indefinite," and "pliable [k]," and ſuch as "all might adopt, in one way or other, without finding fault with their brethern," and about which there ſhould be no more diſpoſition to quarrel "than about an exclamation or an interjection [l]." They are fine animating "Exordiums," containing "nothing didactic [m]." They are "occaſional" expreſſions, and therefore when "general" capable of "particular applications [n];" addreſſes to "collective bodies" of men, and therefore not applicable to individuals [o];

(a) Four Eſſays, p. 84. (b) Ibid. p. 103. (c) Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 230. (d) Ibid. Vol. iv. p. 26. (e) Ibid. p. 30. (f) Ibid. p. 11. (g) Ibid. Vol iii. p. 466. (h) Ibid. Vol. ii. p, 422. (i) Ibid. (k) Ibid. Vol. ii. p. 365. (l) Ibid. (m) Ibid. Vol. iv. p. 34.; Vol. ii. p. 364; Vol. iii. p. 160, 129, 238, 467. (n) Ibid. Vol. i. p. 386. (o) Ibid. Vol. iii. p. 429, 468.

mere "Jewiſh modes of referring all events to God[p];" &c, &c.

In ſhort, whoever takes the trouble to examine, will find, that the great object of Dr. H's "elementary obſervations," "preliminary remarks," and general ſyſtem of interpretation, is to *limit* the plain meaning of thoſe ſcriptures which relate to human impotence and aſcribe our ſalvation to the Grace of God[q]. After this manner, he teaches, *Romans* viii. 28—33, is to be interpreted[r]. Of this claſs of Scriptures, we are informed, are "the openings of ſeveral Epiſtles[s]," and "the whole Epiſtle to the Epheſians[t]." Thus alſo, when the ſcripture ſays, "As many as were *ordained to eternal life*, believed;" "no more," it ſeems, is meant "than that as many as *choſe* to become Chriſtians, were *allowed* to become Chriſtians[v]." And thus, when the Apoſtle in theſe words congratulates the Philippians, "Being confident of this very thing, that he who hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jeſus Chriſt;" this, we are told, "is *merely a compliment* devoutly expreſſed[w]!" and, that "there ſeems no ſufficient reaſon why it ſhould be interpreted more literally than the proverbial expreſſion, 'a good beginning makes a good ending[x].'" &c, &c, &c.

Under theſe hard circumſtances, it may be obſerved by the way, are ſome perſons placed. When certain Gentlemen would depreciate our mode of ſtating our doctrines, which we profeſs to adopt becauſe it is ſcriptural, they call upon us for definitions and preciſion, to "affix *determined ideas* to every word we uſe[y];" when they would vindicate their own ſyſtem, they thus tell us, that the lan-

---

(p) Ibid. Vol. iv. p. 31. (q) See Vol. iii. p. 120—133; 229—243; 106—113; 158—193; 463—485; Vol. iv. p. 25—49, &c. (r) Ibid. Vol. iii. p. 429; Vol. iv. p. 26. (s) Ibid. Vol. iv. p. 26. (t) Ibid. p. 30. (v) Ibid. p. 32. (w) Ibid. Vol. iii. p. 466. (x) Ibid. p. 469. (y) Above, p. 351.

guage of Scripture on such subjects is "popular," and "indefinite," and admits not of this strict philosophical and scientifical" interpretation. It must, however, be pretty clear, that they who take these liberties with the Sacred Writings, are prepared to make them teach just any thing or nothing. It must also be allowed to be no mean compliment to the system we maintain, that they who reject our doctrines are constrained also thus to reject the plain sense of so great a portion of the word of God.

Nor do we see how a more suitable reverence for Revelation can be expected while its meaning and fitness are wholly tried by the standard of men's *preconceived notions*, whether they denominate these notions Philosophy, Natural Religion, Reason, or any thing else. "If," says Dr. Powell, after showing the use of Philosophy as an *Evidence* in behalf of Christianity, "a Witness be allowed to take the seat of a Judge, we can expect nothing but a hasty and partial decision. And such has been the event when *Philosophy has presumed to interpret revealed doctrines*, or to *examine the reasonableness* of revealed dispensations [z]." "The English Clergy," he says again, "have wisely avoided the application of it (Philosophy) where such application is impertinent or profane: impertinent, as in interpretation of Scripture; profane, as in the judging of God's Decrees [a]."

"Revealed religion," adds that eminent Divine Bishop Horsley, "stands not upon the ground of any *antecedent discoveries* of natural Reason; and it is highly impolitic to attempt to place it upon any such false foundation [b]." There seems indeed to be an absurdity upon the face of such a Rule of interpretation. It is beginning at the wrong end, judging of the greater light by the lesser one, examining the lustre of the Sun by the glimmering of a taper.

(z) Ch. iii. p. 337. (a) Ibid. p. 349. (b) Charge, 1796, p. 19.

And what, comparatively, has this philoſophy, this reaſon, this natural religion, ever done for thoſe who have been deſtitute of the advantages of Revelation? Let hiſtory in general [c], let the Sacred Writings, let the beginning of the Epiſtle to the Romans in particular, anſwer. Are the notions here ſpecified, the ſublime diſcoveries by which we are to fix the meaning, and judge of the fitneſs of revealed doctrines? No, Mr. Ludlam will reply, we are not hence "to form an eſtimate of the moral and intellectual character of mankind:" This is only "that wretched ſtate to which man can reduce himſelf by idleneſs, inattention [d]," &c: This is "to ranſack every dark corner of hiſtory for inſtances of atrocious wickedneſs [e]." It deſerves however to be remembered, that it is the Apoſtle's deſcription of both the Jews and Gentiles, the multitude and the Philoſophers, at the advent of Chriſt. And what reaſon have we to ſuppoſe that "if we had been in the days of our fathers, we ſhould not have been partakers with them in" folly [f]? Let the exploits, the aſtoniſhingly enormous exploits, of Philoſophers who have rejected Revelation, in this "Age of Reaſon [z];" let the convulſive groans of Europe, anſwer.

The fact alſo is, that thoſe notions in which the more decent of modern philoſophers boaſt, are themſelves borrowed from the light of Scripture; and thus is the ſacred Book made to furniſh weapons for its own annoyance; thus is a kind of aſſent to ſome parts of it made an obſtacle

---

(c) See as a ſpecimen only what is adduced in Biſhop Gibſon's Paſtoral Letters. (d) Six Eſſays, p. 81. (e) Ibid. (f) Matt. xxiii. 30. (z) "The age in which we live," Biſhop Watſon remarks, "has been called—the age of philoſophy—the age of reaſon: if by reaſon and philoſophy, irreligion be underſtood, it undoubtedly merits the appellation; for there never was an age ſince the death of Chriſt, never one ſince the commencement of the hiſtory of the world, in which atheiſm and infidelity have been more generally profeſſed."——Sermons and Charge, p. 1.

to the reception of the reſt, as if the whole ſtood not upon the ſame authority. Surely then we ſhould be cautious how we implicitly follow a Guide, which, under her faireſt profeſſions, hath ſo frequently thus bewildered men in labyrinths, and precipitated them into ruin.

Let it not however be ſuppoſed that we allow Reaſon no province in our religion but that of eſtimating the evidence of Revelation. This noble faculty muſt alſo be employed in aſcertaining the meaning of Scripture, and to a certain extent, and on ſubjects within the reach of our underſtandings, in judging of the *nature* of doctrines profeſſing to be revealed. For certain it is, that no evidence can prove any doctrine to be true, which is demonſtrated to be falſe by our underſtanding and ſenſes; which is manifeſtly abſurd, or contradictory, or wicked. But although Revelation, rightly underſtood, contains nothing *contrary* to right reaſon, it neceſſarily treats on many ſubjects which in their full extent, are *above* the comprehenſion of our preſent faculties [y]. Of this kind eſpecially are thoſe which relate to the *nature* and *conduct* of God [x]. What we therefore maintain is, that when reaſon is ſatisfied a Revelation is Divine, it is moſt unreaſonable to reject or to evade any doctrines which by legitimate rules of interpretation ſuch

(y) By things *above* reaſon, we mean ſuch notions as Reaſon without the aſſiſtance of Revelation, would never diſcover; whether comprehenſible by our finite capacities or not. By things *contrary* to reaſon, we mean ſuch conceptions as are both undiſcoverable by mere reaſon; and alſo, when underſtood, evidently appear repugnant to ſome principle or concluſion of right reaſon.

(x) "Among things that ſeem not rational in religion," ſaith Mr. Boyle, "I make a great difference betwixt thoſe in which unenlightened Reaſon is manifeſtly a competent judge, and thoſe which natural reaſon itſelf may diſcern to be out of its ſphere. . . If there be ſuch a Being as God, or a Being ſupremely perfect, many things relating to his nature, will, and management of things, muſt needs be beyond the ſphere of reaſon."——Theol. Works, Vol. i. p. 378.

Revelation is found to contain, becauſe we cannot *fully comprehend* their import, or ſee their fitneſs[w]. What we chiefly object to is, the extolling as the dictates of *right reaſon*, and repreſenting as ſome *fixed and certain* criterion of the doctrines of Scripture, thoſe vague, contradictory, and common notions of men, which are more frequently the offspring of pride, ignorance, prejudice, or oppoſition to the holy Will and Character of God[v].

(w) "A thing may," this ſame great Philoſopher adds, "if ſingly or preciſely conſidered, appear unreaſonable, which yet may be very credible, if conſidered as a part of, or a manifeſt conſequence from a doctrine that is highly ſo."——Ibid. p. 398.

(v) "We ought to diſtinguiſh," Mr. B. alſo obſerves, "between reaſon conſidered in itſelf, and reaſon conſidered in the exerciſe of it, by this or that philoſopher, or by this or that man, or ſociety of men. For, Whatever the faculty of reaſon is in itſelf, the ratiocinations are made by men; and therefore if the reaſoning faculty is not made the beſt uſe of, it does not follow, that what thwarts their reaſonings, muſt thwart the dictates of right reaſon; for man having a Will and Affections as well as an intellect, though our judgments ſhould be made with an unbiaſſed underſtanding; yet intellectual weakneſs, prejudices or prepoſſions, by cuſtom, education, intereſt, paſſions, vices, &c. ſo much influence them, that we make few concluſions, or eſpouſe few opinions, which are the true reſults of reaſon, without ſome perſonal diſability, prejudice or fault."—And having further mentioned "man's inbred pride," and other "innate prejudices and propenſities to error which are apt to ſway not only whole ſects, but the whole body of mankind," and having quoted Lord Bacon ſpeaking to the ſame effect, the honourable Writer thus proceeds: "If in phyſical things, where one would think rational Beings ſhould ſeek truth, with no other deſign than to find and enjoy it, our underſtandings are ſo biaſſed by our Wills and affections, no wonder, if we allow the fall of our firſt parents, that our paſſions and intereſt, and frequently our vices ſhould miſlead our intellects about thoſe revealed truths, ſeveral of which are above our compreſions, and more contrary to our inclinations: .... The generality of men may be ſuſpected of ſecret propenſities to err about divine things, and to be indiſpoſed to admit truths, which both lay open the weakneſs

But let us further hear our opponents themſelves on the point. "We object," ſays Dr. Hey, "to calling pre-conceived notions at any æra the dictates of Reaſon, in the more difficult doctrines of Scripture; becauſe reaſon tells us, that we are not to *truſt our pre-conceived notions againſt the Scriptures*, in things which relate to the Nature of God, or to the manner in which he is to act, in order to promote the happineſs of his creatures [g]." To the ſame effect, ſpeaking of the Heretic Marcion, Dr. H. ſays, "He ſeems a ſignal example of the raſhneſs of following *human notions* of what is beſt, in accepting and applying Divine Diſpenſations.—You will ſay, Marcion's fancies ought not to be repreſented as human reaſon: but they were ſo to him, and the notions of the wiſeſt of men, being infinitely ſhort of divine intelligence, may be conceived as on a footing with his, in ſuch a compariſon: and he, who ſets the moſt improved human reaſon in competition with divine Wiſdom, will err in the ſame form with Marcion, though not perhaps in the ſame particulars [h]."

Again, "The Trinitarians," he obſerves, "have formed their doctrine in one way, and the Anti-trinitarians in another: the Trinitarians have collected their doctrine from ſcripture only; the Anti-trinitarians, diſguſted with the difficulties attending that method, or with abuſes of it, and hoping to ſoften and moderate what appeared to them harſh and uncouth, have ſet out from notions of common ſenſe,

---

of nature and our perſonal diſabilities; ſo as to mortify our pride and ambition, and afford the mind ſo pure and chaſte a light as to diſcover our vices and faults, and often to croſs our deſigns and intereſt: Ibid. p. 386—390.——See alſo many excellent remarks relating to this ſubject in Dr. Burgh's two valuable Works. Read particularly his "Scriptural Confutation, &c." Chap. i. p. 13, &c.; and his "Inquiry into the belief of the Chriſtians of the firſt three centuries, &c." Chap. ii. p. 23—43.

(g) Nor. Lect. Vol ii. p. 317. (h) Ibid. Vol. i. p. 372.
(i) Ibid. Vol. ii. p. 264.

reaſon, natural religion; and, taking for granted, that Scripture, if rightly interpreted, muſt coincide with theſe, have interpreted it by bringing it as near to them as poſſible[i]." But "this," it is added, "is not ſimple, genuine interpretation; that, though it be true in theory, that Reaſon and Scripture coincide, yet in practice we are not to take for granted, that our preſent reaſon is perfectly right reaſon; experience is againſt that[k]."

And again, "The pride of Science has often hindered men from treating the doctrines of Revelation with ſufficient reſpect, even on their own principles[l]. . . In the preſent age, we are proud of our philoſophy, and we encourage it ſo much, as to make it ſometimes run out into luxuriance: . . Indeed Chriſtians in all ages, eſpecially thoſe who have prided themſelves on any opinions, have made too free with Scriptures; and many parts of the Canon have been rejected, at different times, becauſe they were, or ſeemed, contrary to certain favourite preconceived notions. The Manicheans had an abhorrence of matter, and therefore all parts of Scripture, which mentioned the uſes of matter, were rejected as ſpurious; the whole Old Teſtament was cut off at one ſtroke; our modern Philoſophers are prodigious friends of matter, and therefore Scripture muſt be conſtrued ſo that even the ſoul may be material. To ſet aſide whole books of Scripture ſeems ſomething more groſs than to interpret; yet, if we ſet aſide the *genuine ſenſe*, we may as well ſet aſide words too; for, deprived of their right ſenſe, words muſt either be uſeleſs, or miſlead[m]."

How excellent is all this! Who would ſuppoſe that they who uſe this language ſhould themſelves be guilty of the very error they ſo ſenſibly reprobate! Yet ſo it is. Theſe Gentlemen, it may be added, are great enemies to the doc-

---

(i) Ibid. Vol. ii. p. 264. (k) Ibid. (l) Ibid. Vol. iii. p. 186. (m) Ibid. Vol. ii. p. 262.

trine of *Salvation by Grace*, and therefore, as we have seen[n], all Scriptures which appear to maintain this doctrine they explain away, and as to any present application annihilate. That portion of the Sacred Writings which relates to these subjects they treat precisely as, according to their complaint, the Socinians treat the Scriptures. On these doctrines we are left to settle our notions of "the nature of God, and the manner in which he is to act," by some other rule than the plain declarations of his Word[o]. Here then we would reply to Dr. Hey and his admirers, in his own words, that, in our judgment, this is not "treating the doctrines of revelation with sufficient respect, even on their own principles; it is being afraid, and almost ashamed of them[p]."

The Church of England on the contrary proceeds on a plan which *inviolably respects all parts of Scripture;* believing that this alone contains "the words of eternal life," that this alone is our infallible Rule of faith and practice, and as hath been observed above, that the *whole* stands upon the same authority. And, in regard to the *Interpretation* of the Sacred Writings, one of the many excellent Rules which her most eminent Divines, and other learned Critics, have adopted, is, that generally, and in respect to essential doctrines, the *plain and literal sense* is to be taken when this interpretation contains nothing "manifestly absurd, or repugnant to the analogy of faith."——"When two different senses of places of Scripture are offered," saith the great Bishop Stillingfleet, "we are to consider which is most reasonable to be preferred, and it is that which, 1st, Is *most plain and easy, and agreeable to the most received sense* of words, especially when it is no sacramental thing, which in its own nature is figurative:... 2dly, That which suits most with

(n) Above, p. 369—373. (o) Besides the places above referred to, see Nor. Lect. Vol. i. p. 4; Vol. ii. p. 263, Note; and Preface to the "List of Books" recommended by the Bishop of Chester, p. 5. (p) Nor. Lect. Vol. iii. p. 186, Note; and above, p. 377.

the ſcope and deſign not only of the particular places, but of the whole New Teſtament, which is to magnify God and depreſs man:... 3dly, That which hath been generally received in the Chriſtian Church to be the ſenſe of theſe places:... 4thly, That which beſt agrees with the character of Chriſt and his Apoſtles from whom we receive the Chriſtian faith [q]."

"Although we acknowledge," adds the learned Biſhop Lowth, "there are ſome things in Scripture hard to be underſtood, yet we ſtill affirm, that all things neceſſary for us to believe and practice, in order to our ſalvation, are delivered there with the *greateſt clearneſs and perſpicuity* [r].... The generality of the holy Writers affect great plainneſs of expreſſion, and make uſe of a popular ſtyle, on purpoſe to condeſcend to vulgar capacities.... The Goſpels are plain and eaſy, and generally intelligible to the meaneſt capacity [s]."

"You are," Biſhop Horſley obſerves to his Clergy, "to ſet forth the wonderful ſcheme of Man's redemption faithfully and exactly, as it is exhibited in the Holy Scriptures; and, upon the authority of the Scriptures in their *plain, natural, unſophiſticated meaning*, in the Offices, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Homilies of the Church of England [m]."

"This" proceeds Biſhop Law, "is the neceſſary canon of interpretation, which of all others I think wants moſt to be recommended, that wherever his (Chriſt's) words ſeem capable of different ſenſes, we may with certainty conclude that to be the true one, which lay moſt level to the comprehenſion of his auditors [t]."

The reaſon for this mode of interpretation aſſigned by Mr. Locke, which accords with the reaſonings of Dr. Powell [v] and Biſhop Lowth [w], is incontrovertible. The Scriptures, this great Philoſopher obſerves, "were deſigned by God

---

(q) On Scripture Myſteries, Oxford Enchciridion Eccleſiaſticum, p. 349. (r) Directions for reading the Scriptures, p. 39. (s) Ibid. p. 52. (m) Ch. 1800, p. 31. (t) Theory of Rel. p. 309. (v) Ch. 3d, p. 339. (w) Directions, p. 40.

for the inſtruction of the illiterate bulk of mankind in the way of ſalvation; and therefore generally and in neceſſary points, are to be *underſtood in the plain direct meaning* of the words and phraſes, ſuch as they may be ſuppoſed to have had in the mouths of the ſpeakers, who uſed them according to the language of that time and country wherein they lived[x]." Whether ſome of theſe Worthies have been ſuch good Divines as to follow their own teaching on this ſubject is another matter. We however ſhall adhere to their excellent Rules, but muſt add, with our Church, that the beſt of all preparations for underſtanding the Scriptures are humility, a willingneſs to be taught by the Spirit, and a diſpoſition to comply with the requiſitions of God's Word[y].

It is however one thing to *interpret* Scripture, and another rightly to *apply* it. "We interpret," Dr. Hey obſerves, "by conſidering the circumſtances of others; we apply, by conſidering our own: or, more ſtrictly ſpeaking, by making a compariſon between the circumſtances of thoſe, to whom Scripture was immediately addreſſed, and our own[z]." But will this conſideration *juſtify*, or *condemn*, the procedure of the Dr. and his friends, with the Scriptures concerning Grace? Is not God in all ages the ſame? Is not human nature the ſame? And is not true religion, in ſubſtance, always the ſame? And does it not hence follow, that, wherever or whenever we are born, or whatever we are denominated, the ſame change of ſtate and character is, in effect, neceſſary for us, which was experienced by more early Chriſtians; and that this change muſt be effected through the ſame Divine influences? And how then can our opponents ſhow that the large portions of God's Word which relate to theſe ſubjects "mean nothing to us[a]?" The proper Rule of procedure is, to conſider the general direc-

(x) Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, p. 2. (y) Homily on Reading the Scripture, p. 5, 6. (z) Nor. Lect. Vol. i. p. 75. (a) See above, Chap. iii. p. 117, 118; and Chap. v. p. 169, &c.; 369, 370.

tions and doctrines of Scripture as applicable to all times, unleſs the Holy Spirit has expreſsly limited them, or ſome ſolid and eſpecial reaſon can be aſſigned why they ſhould be limited to any one particular time. Some parts of the Sacred Writings are certainly both more applicable, and more important, to us than other parts are. Like the great luminaries of the natural World, they do not all ſhine with equal ſplendour, or with equal benefit to mankind. But "all Scripture," we are aſſured, "is given by inſpiration of God, and," directly or indirectly, in one way or another, "is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for inſtruction in righteouſneſs [b];" and it highly becomes us to take heed that we do not, like certain expoſitors of old, "make the commandment of God of no effect [c]" by our gloſſes and evaſions. It becomes us to take heed that we do not teach men to evade the obligation of every divine injunction that is unpleaſant to them, leſt "their blood ſhould be required at our hands [d]."

With theſe conſiderations in view then, we refer to the texts of Scripture quoted by Biſhop Burnet, Biſhop Beveridge, Biſhop Pretyman, Archdeacon Welchman, Dr. Hey, or any other Expoſitor of eminence, for the moſt full and unequivocal confirmation of the plain and expreſs doctrines of our Articles. Theſe Articles indeed, are ſo nearly in ſcripture language, on the doctrines now controverted, as Dr. Hey [e] and Mr. Urban [f] in particular have proved, that on this ground we might reſt immoveably; maintaining that whatever the Scripture means by ſuch language, *that* the Church of England means, and *that* we mean. It is however the Scriptures mutually eſtabliſhing and illuſtrating each other, and forming one conſiſtent body of doctrine, which they preſent to us; the Scriptures unfolding the grand ſcheme of our redemption, as far as is

(b) 2 Tim. iii. 16. (c) Mat. xv. 6. (d) See Ezekiel, iii. 18. (e) See Nor. Lect. on theſe ſubjects.
(f) See the Gentleman's Magazine for April, 1772.

compatible with our preſent faculties; the Scriptures conſpiring to promote the great end of this wonderful undertaking, the glory of God and the holineſs and happineſs of men.

If further commentary upon theſe Scriptures is required, we refer to the Writings of Auſtin, Cyprian, and other primitive Fathers; to the Works of Luther[g], Jewell[h], Davenant[i], Hall[k], and the whole body of the chief founders of our church; to the Expoſitions of Hopkins, Beveridge, Lowth, Scott, Doddridge, &c. &c. &c. The commentary of this laſt mentioned Divine has lately been recommended to his Clergy by the Biſhop of Lincoln[l]. It is recommended alſo by the Biſhop of London[z]. The Biſhop of Durham in his celebrated Charge in 1792 beſtows upon it the very higheſt encomiums. "In reading the New Teſtament," this diſtinguiſhed Prelate ſays, "I recommend Doddridge's Family Expoſitor as an impartial interpreter, and faithful monitor. Other expoſitions and commentaries might be mentioned greatly to the honour of their reſpective authors, for their ſeveral excellencies; ſuch as, elegance of compoſition, acuteneſs of illuſtration, and copiouſneſs of erudition: but *I know of no Expoſitor, who unites ſo many advantages as Doddridge;* whether you regard the ſolidity of his verſion, the fulneſs and perſpicuity of his compoſition, the utility of his general and hiſtorical information, the impartiality of his doctrinal comments, or, laſtly, the piety, and paſtoral earneſtneſs of his moral and religious applications. He has made, as he profeſſes to have done, ample uſe of the Commentators that preceded him; and, in the explanation of grammatical difficulties, he has profited much more from the Philological writers on the Greek Teſtament than could almoſt have been expected in ſo multifarious an

(g) See eſpecially his Comment on the Galations. (h) On the Theſſalonians. (i) On the Coloſſians. (k) Works, paſſim. (l) See Elements, &c. (z) See his Evidences of Chriſtian Revelation, Preface, p. 7.

undertaking as the Family Expositor; indeed, for all the most valuable purposes of a commentary on the New Testament, the Family Expositor cannot fall too early into the hands of those intended for Holy Orders[m]." And yet, let Dr. Doddridge interpret Scripture and our doctrines are indisputable.

These then, in short, are our *Reasons** for adhering to the genuine doctrines of our Articles. We conceive ourselves

(m) Page 51.

* The attentive reader will here see, that, beyond all question, *two* of these three reasons for adhering to the doctrines of the church, equally bind us to adhere to her Polity and established *Discipline*. We are equally engaged to the one conduct as to the other, by our subscription. We have alike, in each respect, the authority and matured judgment of her founders. And, the more their notions of "ecclesiastical polity" are examined throughly, the more, the writer is persuaded, shall we also appear bound to them by our *third* reason for teaching our present doctrines. The whole external structure of the church of England is either founded on express injunctions of Scripture, or on the undoubted *Practice* of the Apostles and Early Christians. This has been satisfactorily shown by Hooker[a] and Milner[b]; and, except where they attempt too much, by Jones[c] and Daubeny[d]. The *Expediency* of our Establishment, as contrasted with any thing that opposes it, has also been convincingly shown by several of these Writers, and might be further demonstrated, from the nature of the thing, the nature of man, and an appeal to historic fact.

On these grounds it is, that the present work so solicitously disclaims all intention of apologizing for any species of irregularity in any ministers of the Establishment. They, surely, with an ill grace reprehend their Brethren for deviating from the church in one instance, who themselves violate equally strong engagements to her in another.

on

(a) Eccles. Pol. (b) Eccles. History. (c) Essay on the Church. (d) Guide to the Church.

bound to this conduct by the moſt expreſs, ſolemn, deliberate, and repeated engagements;——We think theſe Articles, *conſidered*

On the other hand, however, certain Gentlemen ſhould be exceeding cautious, that they do no call that conduct of a miniſter *irregular*, to which he is ſolemnly bound by the vows of his Ordination, the laws of his Church, and the exhortations of our Prelates. Such Gentlemen ſhould be exceeding careful that they do not ſubſtitute their *own practice* in the place of Rubric, Canons, Ordination Vows, and Epiſcopal Exhortation, and condemn every thing as extravagant which exceeds that ſtandard: They ſhould be aware of the abſurdity of repreſenting thoſe Miniſters as Separatiſts and Schiſmatics whoſe whole writings and conduct prove the direct contrary; and who are labouring under the heavieſt reproaches from another quarter, for their bigotry to the church, and their rigid attachment to Forms z.

Our meaning ſhall be illuſtrated by ſome inſtances. In the Ordination ſervice then, we are enjoined "never to ceaſe our labour, our care and diligence, until we have done *all that lieth in us*, according to our bounden duty, to bring all ſuch as are committed to our charge, to ripeneſs and perfectneſs of age in Chriſt." We are exhorted, "As much as lieth in us, to *apply ourſelves wholly* to this one thing, (our office) and to draw all our cares and ſtudies this way." We engage, "to ſeek for Chriſt's ſheep that are diſperſed abroad;" and "to uſe both public and *private* monitions and exhortations, as well to the ſick as to the whole, within our cures." Theſe engagements we are conſtantly reminded of in the charges of our Prelates. See for example that of the Biſhop of London in 1790. Biſhop Butler makes this remark: "Since the great body of the people, eſpecially in country places, cannot be brought to attend the ſervice of the church oftener than one day in a week; and ſince *this is in no ſort enough* to keep up in them a due ſenſe of religion; it were greatly to be wiſhed they could be perſuaded to any thing, which might in ſome meaſure ſupply the want of more frequent public devotions, or ſerve the like purpoſes."... "It were greatly to be wiſhed," he alſo ſays, after obſerving how backward

---

(z) See Belſham's, and Wakefield's Anſwers to Mr. Wilberforce; Mr. Pawſon's Sermons; Dr. Haweis' Hiſtory of the Church, and Reply to the Dean of Carliſle's Preface to the 2d Edition of the 1ſt Vol. of Mr. Milner's Hiſtory; &c. &c.

as a Commentary on Scripture, deſerving of the higheſt reſpect, on account of the ſtrong internal marks of *caution, moderation,*

---

backward men are to make a perſonal application of what they hear in public, "that every man ſhould have the principles of Chriſtianity, and his own particular duty enforced upon his conſcience, in a manner ſuited to his capacity, in *private*." All opportunities, therefore, for this work, his Lordſhip teaches, ſhould be carefully watched for, and ſeized [e].—The preſent Biſhop of Durham, in a ſtrain perfectly ſimilar, having mentioned the difficulties which, "with all the advantages of public worſhip," a poor aged man labours under, ſays, "Much, I conceive, might be done by occaſional conference with him at his own dwelling, concerning the ſtate of his faith, his hopes, and his views of futurity. And, if this conference were accompanied with the reading to him ſome portion of Scripture, &c. his miniſter would do him an act of ineſtimable kindneſs. If you could advance one ſtep beyond this, and induce the aged poor to aſſiſt one another, and form little ſocieties in a large, or one ſociety in a ſmall pariſh, at which thoſe who are readers might read to thoſe who are not, it would be bringing your poor to a moſt deſirable and edifying ſtate of ſpiritual communion [f]."——Do they then act according to either the letter or the ſpirit, of theſe engagements and exhortations, who do no more than the ſtated public duty which they are abſolutely *obliged* to do? And is every thing beyond this extravagant and fanatical?

The Biſhop of London, with the ſame juſt view of the ſubject, ſeriouſly laments the evils ariſing from a want of more frequent public Service in the Church; particularly in the numerous caſes where this ſervice is only performed once in the day. Having excepted ſome inſtances, particularly pariſhes which are ſo near to each other, that the congregations actually go from one Church to the other, "Where this is not the caſe," his Lordſhip obſerves, "it appears to me highly neceſſary that each pariſh ſhould be called to public worſhip, as the Canons, the Liturgy and the Rubric evidently require, both morning and evening. Unleſs this is done, the ſervice is incomplete, there will be one half of the day totally unoccupied by religious duties; and if it is not employed in them, it will be employed, I fear, in a very different manner. It is too large

---

(e) Charge annexed to the Analogy by Biſhop Halifax. (f) Charge, 1797, p. 30. See alſo Biſhop Burnet's Paſtoral Care.

good ſenſe, and knowledge of the Scriptures and of mankind, which they diſcover; and on account of the *very extra-*

large a portion of time to be truſted entirely in the hands of the common people. It is too much to be ſpared from that ſacred day, the whole of which, even when moſt religiouſly obſerved, is hardly ſufficient to counteract the bad impreſſions of the other ſix days of the week. On the due obſervance of this day, and the appropriation of a large portion of it to ſacred purpoſes, depends, I am convinced, the very exiſtence of religion in this country g."—Biſhop Horſley complains, that the Devil frequently gets one half of the people, and the Sectaries the other half, through "the lazy practice" which obtains among the Clergy, in regard to their Sunday duties[n].—From the Divines in queſtion, however, we hear of little but the evils of *exceſs* in the duties of this day. All hours are "unſeaſonable" for religious exerciſes, except thoſe in which they chuſe to labour; all efforts are extravagant except thoſe which they make; and "any additional attendance on the church," they ſay, "would give a puritanical aſpect to the Sabbath, and throw a phariſaical gloom over the moſt cheerful religion in the world[h]."

The 61ſt Canon requires that "Every Miniſter ſhall prepare children for confirmation." This, in Biſhop Butler's judgment, cannot properly be done without perſonal conference[i]. Other Prelates ſtrongly enforce the duty of catechiſing[k]. The 59th Canon requires that "upon every Sunday and Holiday, the Miniſter ſhall for half an hour or more, *examine and inſtruct* the youth and ignorant perſons of his pariſh, in the ten commandments, the articles of the belief, &c." Is no more then implied in this duty than occaſionally hearing children *repeat* the catechiſm? Is every thing beyond this ſchiſmatical?

Another duty to which our Office obliges us is, the Viſitation of the ſick. For our aſſiſtance in a *part* of this Work, our church has provided us a form of words, leaving us in the reſt to exhort and admoniſh according to our diſcretion, as the caſe may require, to "exhort the ſick perſon after her form, or other like." The 67th Canon ſays, "The Miniſter ſhall reſort unto the ſick, ... to inſtruct and comfort,

(g) Charge, 1790, p. 14. (n) Ch. 1800. (h) See Mr. Polwhele's Letters, p. 70; above 234 *t* &c. (i) Charge as above. (k) London, Durham.

ordinary degree of talents, learning, labour, and piety, which were united and exerted in their formation:——We believe, after fully examining for ourselves, and attending to the most legitimate rules of interpretation, that *they are supported by the true and genuine sense of Scripture.*

---

fort them in their distress, according to the order of the Communion Book, if he be no preacher: or *if he be a preacher, then as he shall think most needful and convenient.*" And thus is this duty, and this manner of performing it, enforced by our Prelates. "In many cases," the Bishop of Durham, earnestly recommending diligence in this work, observes, "the funeral service might be used with almost as much propriety as the office for the sick. . . . It tends, therefore, greatly to improve this season of affliction, where the Minister anticipates the call (of the sick or their friends). Such visits of neighbourly inquiry might, I presume, easily be converted into occasions of religious instruction. The earlier visits might be allotted both to general and appropriate conversation and instruction; the office for the sick being reserved for cases of danger." Ch. 1797, p. 31.——Much good, Bishop Horsley also supposes may be done, "by a cheerful, unwearied assiduity in the charitable office of visiting the dying and the sick." And, "Upon these occasions," his Lordship observes, "You will not think it enough to repeat the prayers at the bed-side, which the church has provided, but you will make inquiry into the actual state of the sick person's soul; that you may administer such advice or consolation, as his case may demand." Ch. 1800, p. 23. Yet one circumstance by which the schism and fanaticism of some Evangelical Ministers are thought to be proved unquestionably, is, that they "visit the sick, and use not the prescribed form." See Mr. Polwhele's third Letter, p. 26 —The regard shown to the Canons which respect Simony and Residence has been noticed above.

What a pity then it is, that the anxiety of any Ministers about their Brethren's supposed *errors of excess*, should induce them so entirely to overlook their own notorious *errors of defect!* What a pity it is, that in this most important of all services, remissness should be honourable, and only zeal a disgrace! The whole of our present object, however, is to show, that although we have an equal regard for the *Discipline* as for the Doctrine of our Church, we must not consider every thing a violation of her Laws, and an opposition to her Governors, which some persons would insinuate to be so.

CHAP. IX.

The Recapitulation and Concluſion.

HERE then the Reader is requeſted to ſum up the evidence which has been adduced, to obſerve its various bearings and concentration on our point, and hence to form his concluſion. The *leading Queſtion*, he will recollect, is, Whether *our* doctrines or thoſe of our opponents moſt reſemble the *plain, genuine, and primitive doctrines* of the Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies, of the Church of England [n]?—And, in this review of the ſubject, let him attend,

Firſt, to the arguing againſt our opponents, from their conduct in Subſcription [o], their own Conceſſions [p], and the Complaints of our Biſhops [q]. Let him conſider whether they can be expected to believe and teach according to this *plain and primitive ſenſe* of theſe Articles, who avow that they *do not conſider them as propoſitions to be believed*; who tell us expreſsly that they have a *new and acquired* ſenſe in which they are honeſtly ſubſcribed; or, who lament that, in conſequence of the errors of thoſe times, they contain *many doctrines* which are objectionable, and on which they openly plead for latitude or reformation? Let him obſerve the language of theſe Gentlemen reſpecting the inaccuracy and enthuſiaſm of certain of our Articles, and the effects of age on ſuch compoſitions. Let him hear the moſt reſpectable

(n) Above, p. 17. (o) Ibid. p. 17—30. (p) Ibid. p. 30—36. (q) Ibid. p. 36—42.

of them expreſsly and repeatedly acknowledging that "a defection from the church is widely extended, and a ſurrender of its orthodox principles called for, even by its own ſons:" "that many are deſirous, at this time, to make a *change* in the doctrine of the national church; ſome of theſe Philoſophers and Scholars; ſome even Miniſters of the church:" that "our ableſt Divines have gradually departed from ſome rigorous interpretations of the articles that prevailed at firſt:" that it "is juſtly thought to be a great and crying abuſe, that our Preachers *neglect the goſpel*, and take what they call good natural religion into the pulpit," "more in the manner of Ariſtotle than of Chriſt: and that it is "well known that the *Articles* lean to *our ſide* of the queſtion." Let him ſay whether ſuch great Prelates as Secker, Porteus, Horne, Horſley, and Barrington are not competent judges on the ſubject; and then peruſe the plain, full, unequivocal, and deciſive teſtimony by which they prove this departure from the Articles. Let him obſerve theſe moſt unimpeachable witneſſes at once maintaining the exiſtence of this deviation, aſſigning the cauſes of it, lamenting its evils, and labouring with all their energy for its correction; recommending, in the place of it, with the utmoſt pious zeal and eloquence, the very ſtyle of preaching by which we are characterized, and which we here defend. The Reader who has attentively conſidered only theſe particulars will perhaps have begun to think that, whatever becomes of *our* caſe, the poſition of our opponents muſt be difficult to maintain. He is requeſted however for further ſatisfaction reſpecting both, to review next,

Our inveſtigation of the real ſenſe of the Articles, and doctrines of the Reformers; and our appeal to this ſenſe, on the queſtion [r]. And here he will particularly remark, that the Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy of our church, each mutually illuſtrate and confirm the natural and full ſenſe of

(r) Above, p. 44—99.

the other [s]: that we are bound in the plain, literal, grammatical and full meaning of the Articles, and to one determined ſenſe, by the title and preamble annexed to them [t]: that the object and ſituation of our Reformers, placed between two oppoſite extremes, would induce them to uſe the greateſt caution in the expreſſion of their ſentiments; as they could not expreſs themſelves *too ſtrongly* againſt one claſs of errors without encouraging the other [v]: that the Confeſſions of the Martyrs, Nowell's Catechiſm, Jewell's Apology, and every other public and approved Writing of our Reformers, confirms the ſame interpretation [w]; that our opponents betray the weakneſs of their cauſe by the omiſſion of this, and a recurrence to illegitimate evidence [x]: that the Authorities which the founders of our church reſpected, the common doctrines of the Reformation, the Body of the Confeſſions of the Proteſtant Churches, and eſpecially the Works of their great model St. Auſtin, alſo fully juſtify our notions [y]: that, as fully appears from the unanimous teſtimony of men of all ſentiments, their other Writings, and the Conceſſions and reaſonings of Arminians, the private ſentiments of our Reformers were thoſe now uſually termed calviniſtic [z]; that on this ground alone we might well ſettle the whole queſtion at iſſue, theſe ſentiments being uniformly diſcarded by our opponents, and, under the reſtrictions ſpecified above, uſually recognized by us [a]: But, that from all theſe conſiderations together it appears moſt unqueſtionably,

That the founders of our Church meant, at the leaſt, to *eſtabliſh all they have expreſſed*, in our public forms; that on many occaſions they went *beyond* what is neceſſarily implied in the letter of the Articles, and diſcovered ſentiments ſtill further from the Divinity we oppoſe; but that they never by any means, *abridged or reſtricted the full and natural ſenſe*

(s) Ibid. p. 45. (t) Ibid. p. 45—48. (v) Page 48—55.
(w) Page 55—64. (x) Page 57 and 68. (y) Page 64—68.
(z) Page 69—93. (a) Page 93—97.

of their words, and moſt certainly never intended they ſhould be ſo interpreted: And,

That hence, it follows as undoubtedly, that all who after the manner of our Opponents *extenuate or evade* the plain, literal, full meaning of theſe Articles, on the doctrines in queſtion, do *not* "teach them as they were firſt delivered by our Reformers:" And,

That hence alſo, on the other hand, it undeniably follows, that they who after our method adhere to this plain and full meaning of the Articles, *do teach* them in their genuine and primitive ſenſe; and that they who, to a certain extent, exceed this literal meaning on the ſide of Divine Agency, do not teach *more* than was taught by our Reformers. And here our opponents are challenged to ſhow, by fair quotation, from the Writings of any perſon here vindicated, any doctrine that *exceeds this ſtandard*; any thing that in its natural tendency, and by fair conſtruction, *means more* than what is plainly taught in our Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy, and illuſtrated by the other Writings, and known ſentiments, of our Reformers. Till this is done, the Reader may perhaps be diſpoſed to *conclude* it is as certain that *we have*, as that *they have not*, adhered to the true and primitive doctrines of theſe forms [b].

Let him however proceed to a compariſon of the teaching of our Church, our Opponents, and Ourſelves, in reſpect to, the *uſe* made of the peculiar doctrines of the goſpel, and the *neceſſity of practical Chriſtianity* [c]. And here eſpecially, let him compare the language of our Reformers at the ſtake, and that of every page of his Prayer Book, with the profeſſed "maxims," and "cold ratiocination of theſe Theologians." Let him obſerve, that while with the *one* the Redeemer is *every thing*; the ſoul that animates the whole body of their religion; "their object, their ſubject, and their hope;" with what a *ſparing uſe*, and *occaſional*

(b) Page 98—99. (c) Page 100—127.

mention of him the others are satisfied. Let him contrast the strong manner in which our Church insists upon the *necessity* of *personal* and *practical Christianity* in order to everlasting salvation, the *clear distinction* she makes between the *good* and *evil* among her professing members, and her awful warnings to the latter; with the addresses of these Gentlemen to the *whole body of Professors* of Christianity, their *confounding* the Church of Christ with the national Establishment, and their disposition to *sneer* at all pretensions to any *change of state and character*, any *marks of distinction* from other nominal Christians, or any thing that can be called *experience* in religion. The attentive Observer will probably see as great a difference between the Church and the Ministers in question in *these particulars*, as upon any theoretic doctrines. But that he may not rest in *general* reasoning, and may arrive at the utmost certainty on our question, with these considerations in view,

Let the Reader also recall to his mind, Our examination of the point on the particular and important doctrines of Human Depravity [d], Repentance, Justification, and Good-Works.——On the *first* of these great doctrines, Let the evasive, doubting, palliating, extenuating, annihilating interpretations of these Divines, be placed beside the express, decisive, plain, strong, full, and repeated language of our Church. Let it be seen, whether, their denial of our original corruption altogether; their doubts whether our evil propensities are at all owing to Adam's transgression; their notions respecting the obscurity with which the doctrine is delivered; their limitation of this depravity or its effects to *some* of our race, to *some* of our faculties, or to so *partial* a disorder of any of them; their mild doctrine respecting the desert and threatened punishment of sin; and their ideas of the great powers man naturally possesses for restoring himself to holiness and the Divine favour,—do not form a per-

(d) Page 128—159.

fect contraſt to what is produced from our Articles, Homilies, Liturgy, Catechiſm, Nowell's Catechiſm, Jewell's Apology, Roger's Expoſition, the Augſburgh Confeſſion, the Declarations of Cranmer, Hooper, Latimer, Bradford, and the confeſſion containing "the common belief of the Profeſſors in thoſe days?" Let it be remarked, how nearly impoſſible it is that we ſhould uſe ſtronger language on this ſubject than what is here found, and how it muſt exceed the powers of our Opponents, or of man, to produce a ſingle paſſage which goes beyond this ſtandard, from the late popular Work ſo immediately charged with "a ſuperabundance of Orthodoxy," and with "going beyond the creed of the Church of England;" or, from the Works of any Author within the limits of our apology.

On the doctrine of *Repentance* [e], the compariſon to be recollected is, between the deſcription given by the church, whoſe language we adopt, of the *nature* of this work, as implying "a full converſion to God in a new life," "a being clean changed and altered," a becoming "new creatures," &c.; and that of theſe Divines, who reject the application of ſuch terms to the profeſſors of Chriſtianity, and conceive that perſons thus circumſtanced muſt be radically right and can only need ſome external or *partial change* of character: between *her* notions of the *extent* to which this change is neceſſary, who requires it in all her members that have arrived at maturity; and *theirs*, who nearly confine it to the openly profligate: between *her* views of the *origin* of *Repentance*, who aſcribes it to the gift of Chriſt and the influences of his Spirit; and *theirs*, who repreſent it as a work to be performed by man "before he can hope for any aid from the goſpel:" between *her* ideas of the *concomitants* of true Repentance, who uſes the moſt genuine language of humiliation, contrition, and anxiety; and *theirs*, who are ſo dif-

(e) Page 160—177.

poſed to treat all viſible and earneſt ſolicitude about the ſpiritual ſtate with ridicule.

On *Juſtification*[f], our ideas of it, taken from Cranmer and the Article, as implying *forgiveneſs of ſin* and the being *accounted righteous before God*, will be remembered. This definition will be compared with the notions of theſe Divines about *two* juſtifications, about juſtification as *ſynonimous to baptiſm*, as implying only the *pardon of ſin*; and their repreſentation of our view of it, as *unintelligible*, *impoſſible*, and *blaſphemous*.

Here particularly, beſides the Words of our Article and Homilies, the language of Cranmer, Latimer, Farrar, Coverdale, Hooper, Taylor, Bradford, Rogers, Nowell, Hooker, Bacon, will be contraſted with that of Hey, Daubeny, Ludlam, and Polwhele.——Our notions of *juſtifying Faith*, and of the *manner* in which it juſtifies, taken immediately from the Homilies, as conſiſting eſpecially, in a *truſt in God's mercy through Chriſt for ſalvation* which *produces* obedience; and *juſtifying* as it *apprehends Chriſt*, will be compared with theirs, who do not think *any particular doctrines* eſſential to ſalvation, who deny the exiſtence of a ſpiritual union between believers and Chriſt, who conceive that juſtifying faith conſiſts in *common honeſty*, in an *aſſent to Chriſtianity*, or in *both faith and practice*; and that it *juſtifies* as it thus *includes practice*.——Our opinion, ſtated in the expreſs words of the Article, "that we are juſtified BY *faith only*, and *only* FOR *the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*," will be contraſted with their own conceſſions on the point; their reſtriction of juſtification in this world to *baptiſm*, when under its uſual circumſtances, both faith and works are equally impoſſible; their unwillingneſs wholly to exclude our *own merits* in the affair; and their expreſs doctrines that we are juſtified *by works*, by faith in Chriſt as it ſupplies the *defects of our own obedience*, and *by faith and good works together*. On

(f) Page 178—219.

this point, it will be remembered, our views are supported by the natural construction of the Article, the express language and obvious reasoning of the Homilies, the Bishops and Martyrs in Queen Mary's time, the Augsburgh Confession, Nowell, Jewell, Hooker, Luther, Warburton, Horsley.

On the subject of *Good-Works* [g], the Church, it will also be recollected, prescribes a *perfect Standard* of Morals [h]: These Gentlemen object to this Rule and substitute *Sincerity* in the place of it [i]. The Church conceives that our *first duty* is our *duty to God*; with these Divines the duties of the first table have but a *secondary* importance [k]. The Church also inculcates with true scriptural strictness and seriousness the duties of the *second table* [l]: This will be compared with the Apologies of these Moralists for the *Stage* in its present state, and for other scenes of dissipation [m]; and with their notions on Loyalty [n], Residence [o], Veracity [p], Candour [q], and Charity [r].

The Church of England considers good Works as the *natural fruit* and *necessary effect* of true Christian faith [s]: these Theologians positively reject this notion, and represent it as absurd and dangerous [t]. Our Church represents a holy life as the only satisfactory evidence of a justified state, and considers none Christians indeed who do not exhibit a Christian conduct [v]: our Opponents consider all persons real Christians who are educated in Christian countries, except professed Infidels and notorious offenders against the good order of society [w]." The *leading motives* on which the Church inculcates morality on Christians are, a regard to the authority of God, and gratitude to Christ [x];

(g) Page 220—331. (h) P. 220—228. (i) P. 228—235.
(k) P. 222 and 234—236. (l) P. 223. (m) P. 237—244.
(n) P. 244—251. (o) P. 251—255. (p) P. 255—259.
(q) P. 259—268. (r) P. 268—271. (s) P. 273—276.
(t) P. 277—282. (v) P. 283—285. (w) P. 112—125.
(x) P. 285—288.

the chief arguments by which these Teachers enforce it are, of a *selfish* nature, that men may recommend themselves to the favour of God, become worthy of the mediation of Christ, or obtain heaven as their reward[y]. Our Church in the most full, frequent, and solemn manner applies to ungodly and impenitent sinners the awful denunciations of God's Word[z]; these Divines are always shy of such denunciations and exert their utmost ingenuity to soften and mitigate them[a]: &c, &c, &c.

Let the subject then be viewed in all this variety of lights; let this mass of evidence be considered separately and collectively; let whatever is doubtful be rejected, and what is frivolous disregarded; and then let it be said, whether upon the whole our claim is not better founded than that of our Opponents? Nay, then let it be said, whether the conclusion is not established on grounds equal to demonstration, that WE DO, and that THEY DO NOT *teach according to the plain, primitive, genuine doctrines of our Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies.*

We then are the TRUE CHURCHMEN; and, whatever astonishment certain Critics may express at the affirmation, in a very fundamental and important sense of the word, Mr. Daubeny and his Associates are DISSENTERS from the Church of England. For, these Critics themselves being judges, "The want of union in the Church on the meaning of its articles, is manifestly on the side of those who have *departed* from the Church. They who still remain with the Church, acknowledge, by the very act of adherence, that all is right. They who do not adhere to the Church, who do not *speak the same things* as the Church, who are not *perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment*, are *not* of the Church; they are *Schismatics*, strictly and truly, according to the Apostle's own definition[z].

(y) P. 296, 297 (z) P. 299. (a) P. 302—305. (z) Anti-jacobin Review for April, 1801, p. 430.

1. Hence then, it is hoped, that all real friends of the Church will learn *not to confound her genuine doctrines with the tenets of Separatists and Schismatics.* If, through the unwarrantable deviations of one class of her Ministers from these doctrines, some *distinction* among them is requisite, in the name of common honesty and common prudence, let it not be such as reflects disgrace on those who have conscientiously adhered to them. This method of proceeding must be as pernicious in its tendency, as it is unjust in itself. It is the most effectual way to make this departure from the established doctrines still more extensive; it has in no small degree contributed toward its present extent. It is an opinion in which persons of the greatest respectability of all parties concur, that nothing has so much "deterred many Ministers of the Church of England from enforcing the doctrines contained in her Articles [b]," as the fear of being thus *classed with a Sect.* And what wonder? To be denominated Enthusiasts, to be made responsible for extravagances which they detest, to have their interests blasted, and even the soundness of their reason questioned; who is sufficient to endure all this? What but a conviction of the most *indispensable necessity* being upon them, can induce *any* Ministers to adhere to these doctrines? Who that values either peace, or reputation, or emolument will not keep at a marked distance from all liability to inconveniences like these?

Yet as the aspersion of the real doctrines of the Establishment is a necessary apology for those who have deserted them, it is not surprizing to find them under this obloquy, nor will it be easy to free them from it. Of this the true friends of the Church should be particularly aware. Let those who really exceed her doctrines or violate her disci-

---

(b) See Dr. Knox's Christian Philosophy; the British Critic for Sept, 1796, p. 283; Bishop Horsley's Ch. p. 4; the Critical Review for July 1800, p. 336.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

pline be pointed out distinctly. But let not this be done by preferring against them vague and unsupported charges of folly and fanaticism, but by a specific and substantiated statement of the particular points on which they are believed to err. And let all proper means be used to "show unto them our more excellent way."—Let those "who say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie [c]," be treated according to their desert. Let their hypocrisy be unmasked, and their inconsistencies exposed; so that if we cannot "make *them* to come and worship before" our Altars, they may be disabled from perverting others. And if any are indeed found so far "of the synagogue of Satan [d]," as under the profession of friendship to be seeking the hurt of our Zion, let them escape no chastisement that Christianity warrants. And let it be invariably inculcated, that to constitute a genuine Churchman, an obedience to her authority is equally essential with an adherence to her doctrines.

We are perfectly of opinion with the Critic, that "As the acquiescence of an Arian in the discipline of the Church seems by no means to justify his subscription to the Articles, the most rigid belief of the doctrines of the Church is no" justification of a contempt for her discipline [e]. We must therefore here take the liberty to assure this Critic, that he is the farthest possible from the fact, when he represents the views and conduct of Dr. Haweis as a fair specimen of the general opinions of the Clergy of the Church of England who are called Evangelical [f]. The general body of these Divines, as sincerely lament the *Schism* of Dr. Haweis, as the *Heterodoxy* of some other Doctors.

In short then, let the sincere friends of the established Church in every way exercise their vigilance and seek her prosperity. But, as they value her salvation, let them above

(c) Revela. iii. 9. (d) Ibid. (e) Critical Review May, 1800, p. 20 (f) See Ibid. p. 18.

all things beware, that, amidſt profeſſions of attachment, they do not, through the ſeductions of modern innovators, diſparage her characteriſtic doctrines by confounding them with Sectariſm; that they do not unite with perſons of this deſcription in rendering a conſcientious adherence to her a *reproach*; that they do not contribute to render *that conduct of her Miniſters reproachful*, to which they have ſolemnly bound themſelves, in the face of this Church, and the preſence of their God.

But hence alſo, How exceedingly unbecoming muſt the conduct of our Opponents appear? In their clamour againſt our tenets, they *publicly attack* and contemptuouſly revile the *very doctrines* which they have *publicly profeſſed to believe*, and *ſolemnly engaged themſelves to teach*. In cenſuring our conduct, they criminate us for diſcharging that duty, which, under equal obligations to it, they criminally neglect. To one claſs of theſe Divines we will therefore take the liberty to ſay, *Study the doctrines of your Church*. Examine the Articles and Homilies in which theſe doctrines are contained. Read with ſerioufneſs and attention the other principal Writings of our Reformers, to whom you have alſo appealed. This would reſtrain them in future from thus, at once, advancing wrong charges againſt a large body of their Brethren, and proclaiming their own inconſiſtencies. This would render their "zeal" for the Church more "according to knowledge;" prevent them from confounding things that are ſeparate, and incompatible; and enable them hereafter to *promote*, inſtead of *injuring* the cauſe they undertake.

To another claſs of ſuch Miniſters we would beg leave to ſay, *Act more ingenuouſly*. If, in their judgment, the real doctrines of the Church will not endure the light of this age of Reaſon, let them acknowledge this like men; lay the blame where it ſhould be; ſolicit a reformation; or relinquiſh their connections with her. But let them not diſingenuouſly ſubſcribe to theſe doctrines, and pretend to teach

them, and yet at the ſame time by hints and inſinuations repreſent them, when really adhered to by their Brethren, as the peculiarities of enthuſiaſtic Sectariſts. Let them not endeavour to ſupport a pure religion, the miniſters of this religion, the whole national eſtabliſhment, by evaſions and ſubterfuges that would not be tolerated in the affairs of common life. The attempt is as hopeleſs, as it is unjuſtifiable. Such a mode of vindicating the Church, can only excite the tears of her friends, the ſcorn of her enemies, and betray alarming ſymptoms of her condition.

"The Church," ſays a determined enemy of it, the ſhrewd Mrs. Barbauld, "will be in great danger whenever it has within itſelf many who have thrown aſide its doctrines, or even who do not embrace them in the ſimple and obvious ſenſe.... If the people ſhould ever find that your Articles are generally ſubſcribed as Articles of peace, they will be apt to remember they are Articles of expence too [h]."

And really, to what does the profeſſed zeal of theſe Gentlemen for the Church amount? Allowing the very utmoſt to Externals that can with any reaſon be demanded; yet, as the Lord himſelf aſks on an occaſion very ſimilar, and which exceedingly deſerves our attention, "What is the chaff to the wheat [i]?" What is the beſt external Policy without the pure doctrines of the Goſpel? And, what credit would be allowed to a Commander who ſhould keep up a vigorous defence of the outworks, but treacherouſly conſpire with the enemy to plunder the city? How unadequate is that defence, which ſuffers the *chief treaſures* that make preſervation deſirable, to be taken away? Or to put the appoſite language of the Britiſh Critic interrogatively,

---

(h) See her Addreſs on the Repeal of the Corpora. and Teſt. Acts, 1790; See alſo Mr. Frend's 1ſt Letter to Biſhop Pretyman; the Confeſſional, Chap. vii. p. 270, &c. (i) Jerem. xxiii. 28.

"If, in compliance with the depraved habits of thinking, the indolence, the foppery, and ſuperficial information of an age of infidelity, the *doctrines* of the Church are to be either treacherouſly compromiſed, openly ſurrendered, or ſecretly diſavowed; if, to the ſpecious names of liberality of ſentiment, the right of private judgment, and freedom of inquiry, the faith of Chriſt is to be ſacrificed, how little does it import, whether the Epiſcopal, the Preſbyterian, or the Independent regimen be the medium of ſuch a ſurrender[k]?" A proper attention to the "outſide," in reſpect to Church matters, is therefore a poor apology for neglecting that which is "within." "Theſe things ought they to have done, and not to leave the other undone[l]."

But, if we have been at all ſucceſsful in another part of our Work, very weighty reaſons for teaching the real doctrines of our Articles have appeared, beſides our having ſubſcribed them.——Theſe Articles, it has been ſhown, carry upon the face of them ſtrong marks of caution, moderation, knowledge of the Scriptures, and of the Fathers, and of Mankind: The objections preferred againſt them are unfounded, or frivolous: The difficulties attending them are ſuch as neceſſarily ariſe from the nature of the ſubject, and from which in reality no ſyſtem of religion is more free: They diſplay the very higheſt wiſdom on theſe deep points, about which ſerious Chriſtians have often been divided: And in ſhort, ſtanding only on the ground of their own internal excellence, they ſhrink not from the ſtricteſt ſcrutiny; they challenge a compariſon with any body of doctrine whatever[m]. They have, moreover, a high claim to our reſpect in conſideration of the *circumſtances* under which they were prepared, the *mode* of their formation, the *characters* who compiled them, and the *extraordinary degree* of intellect, learning, labour, and unqueſtionable

(k) Jan. 1796, p. 71.
(l) Mat. xxiii. 23—27.
(m) Above, p. 347—457.

integrity that were united and exerted upon them[n]. Till therefore any contrary doctrines can ſhow as high an origin, they have no right to equal veneration. Till ſome *new* ſyſtem comes recommended by as high an Authority, it is moſt rational to adhere to the *old* one, and to conclude that it *is better*.

But theſe Articles are alſo ſupported by the fair and legitimate interpretation of Scripture. This has eſpecially appeared from obſerving how thoſe who evade the plain doctrines of the Articles evade alſo the plain meaning of Revelation, and from a reference to the moſt eminent Commentators[o]. This then is an appeal to the higheſt authority. The Word of God is an Umpire before which all parties will bow. And, what affords a ſtrong argument that we rightly underſtand the deciſion of Scripture, it has further been ſhown that the *true doctrines* of our Church are moſt efficacious in *bleſſing and mending mankind*[p]. The oppoſers of theſe doctrines, as underſtood by us, may reſt perfectly eaſy about the *intereſts of morality*. Or rather, they may confeſs uniformly, what they do occaſionally, and what there is undoubted evidence for believing, that it is the *ſtrictneſs* of our moral ſyſtem which diſguſts them[q]. For, by a very full and minute examination, it has been proved, that we hold equally the neceſſity of *ſanctification* as of *juſtification*, and that whether regard is had to the *Rule* of morality, or to its *Sanctions*, or to its *eſſential Neceſſity* in Chriſtianity; our ſyſtem is *much ſtricter* than theirs[r]. And, by a very large appeal to experience, the adduction of many particular inſtances, and their own conceſſions, it has alſo been proved, that theſe are the doctrines which have always been moſt happily efficacious in producing a real change for the better among men[s].

(n) P. 357—368. (o) P. 368—382. (p) P. 306—328. (q) P. 328—331. (r) P. 230—332. (s) See Note, (p.)

2. Such then, are the doctrines of the Church of England; and such are the ſtanding obligations of her Miniſters to adhere to theſe doctrines. And never, ſurely, were they more imperiouſly called upon to "take heed both unto themſelves and unto their doctrine[t]," than in the preſent awful circumſtances of religion, and of Europe. The eighteenth Century has brought forth "a regularly digeſted plan[v]" for the extirpation of the Chriſtian religion, and the propagation of Anarchy. The attempt has ſucceeded to a degree aſtoniſhing in its extent, and tremendous in its conſequences. Exiled therefore, deſerted, or abuſed, by every other nation, Chriſtianity, with order, harmony, and other of her attendants, has ſought her chief, her laſt aſylum here. We ſtand in the momentous ſituation of guardians of the religion and morals of the world. Our Governors have nobly acted *their* part in protecting the *external form* of Chriſt's religion, but it is *ours* to protect her purity, and diſplay her internal excellencies; and ineffectual will be the beſt efforts of the Chriſtian Magiſtrate in this glorious cauſe, unleſs they are properly ſupported by thoſe of the Chriſtian Miniſter. In vain the unparelleled exertions of wiſdom in our Stateſmen; in vain the prodigies of valour achieved by our Heroes; in vain our vaſt expenſe of blood and treaſure, muſt all ultimately prove, for the ſalvation of our Country, unleſs, by the exertions of her appointed Watchmen, a general reverence for religion, and her eſtabliſhed ordinances, can be preſerved in the great maſs of the people. And yet,

Here alſo alas! *on their preſent plan of preaching and procedure*, the ſtate of the eſtabliſhed religion is become deplorable. How painful to every true friend of his church muſt it be to learn, from the concurring teſtimony of her great Prelates, who cannot be ſuſpected of either prejudice

(t) 1 Tim. iv. 16. (v) See Biſhop of Lincoln's Ch. 1800, p. 9.

or exaggeration, that, " even in this country," there is " an *almoſt univerſal lukewarmneſs and indifference* in Chriſtians, reſpecting the eſſentials of their religion," and an increaſe of " Scepticiſm and Infidelity [w] :" that here alſo " the characteriſtics of the preſent times are, confeſſedly, *Infidelity*, and an *unprecedented Indifference* to the Religion of Chriſt among profeſſed believers [x] :" that " on one half of the Lord's day good inclinations carry the more pious part of our pariſhioners to the Conventicle; and the Devil invites thoſe of another caſt to the Alehouſe [n] :" that the danger which points moſt certainly " to the calamity of this country; and which apparently advances by neither ſlow nor ſecret ſteps, is, that ariſing from a national depravity; a *general deterioration in the moral and religious conduct in the body of the Country, collectively viewed*; that melancholy abandonment of better habits, which God has in no caſe permitted to go finally unpuniſhed :" and that hence, " it requires neither prophecy, nor the interpretation of prophecy, to decide upon the too probable fate of theſe kingdoms [y]."

How lamentably convincing are the acknowledgments of thoſe who would be moſt backward in admitting too much, that " Modern Chriſtianity is a dead thing :" that ſuch is the " degenerate ſtate of things," that " the meaning annexed to the term *vital Chriſtianity*, is, to the *bulk of profeſſing Chriſtians* become *unintelligible* :" that there has been a " progreſſive decline of genuine Chriſtianity," and a " growing progreſs" of wickedneſs among us [z] : that ſhould the number of Sectariſts " continue to encreaſe with the ſame rapidity which has marked their progreſs of late, the conſequences may prove fatal to the eſtabliſhment [a] :" that

(w) Biſhop Barrington's Ch. 1797, p. 2 and 20. (x) Biſhop Pretyman's Ch. 1800, p. 10. (n) Ch. 1800, p. 27. (y) Bp. Cleaver's Ch. 1799, p. 6, 7, 11. (z) Mr. Daubeny's Guid, p. 315, 316, 381. (a) Antijac. Review, Sept. 1799, p. 102.

from a ſingle city, that "of Saliſbury alone, there iſſues forth on the Sabbath, no leſs a number than between fifty and ſixty Diſſenting preachers[o]:" that, "in a population of 64,000 Inhabitants, there appear to be 52,000 on a ſtate bordering upon indifference to the rights of the Church[p]:" that the Church of England now, compared with what it has been, is like an oak cleft to ſhivers with wedges made out of its own body:" and that they cannot "without anxiety look forward[b]."

What friend of virtue and his Country muſt not tremble to hear, that ſuch is "the increaſed prevalence of immoral and vicious habits," and ſuch the "woeful depravity of public manners," that a "ſcene of actions, fit only for a brothel," is "publicly tolerated:" that ſuch is "the vaſt number and increaſed impudence" of wicked perſons, "that unleſs ſome ſtrong and deciſive meaſures be ſpeedily adopted for the more effectual repreſſion of vice and immorality, for putting an immediate ſtop to the flagitious practices that pollute our ſtreets, for inforcing an obſervance of decency and decorum in our places of public reſort; that unleſs, in ſhort, a general reform take place in the morals and manners of every deſcription of people, we can ſee not the ſmalleſt reaſon to hope for our eſcape from the ſame dreadful fate, which the juſt vengeance of an offended God has, at different times, inflicted on various nations of the earth, *not more degenerate, not more profligate*, than our own[c]?"

What "a matter of juſt and fearful alarm," it may well be to every churchman, to find from the Reports of the Biſhop and Clergy of one Dioceſe, that ſo "rapidly the evil of irreligion may and does diſſeminate itſelf through the maſs of the people at this moment,... that above forty

(o) Daubeny's Appendix, p. 500. (p) See Archdeacon Woodhouſe's Charge, 1800. (b) Daubeny's Appendix, p. 643. (c) Antijacobin Review, June, 1800, p. 205, 206.

thouſand perſons in one pariſh paſs the Lord's Day without attention to public worſhip under any mode whatever[d];" and to hear alſo, at the ſame time, of "the extraordinary increaſe of diſſenting congregations regiſtered within theſe very few years in this Dioceſe[e]?"

How ſimilar an apprehenſion muſt be excited by the ſtatement of facts given by the Clergy of a diſtrict in another Dioceſe, and recognized by the Dioceſan, from which it appears, "that the ordinary number of attendants on divine ſervice does not amount to *one third part* of the number of inhabitants," and that "the communicants are not *one ſixth* part of the adults;" that theſe people are alſo otherwiſe extremely inattentive to the inſtructions of their Clergy, and to religious duties; and that here alſo there are increaſing numbers of ſeparatiſts? How ſtill more alarming is the conſideration when we are informed by the great Prelate himſelf, that "this Report is allowed to deſcribe a *great part of the kingdom*[f]?"

How ſtrongly is this caſe of diſtreſs alſo repreſented in the united cry of theſe Divines for ſome extraordinary interpoſition of the legiſlature[g]? But in ſhort, this is a truth, as much too obvious to require proof, as it is too melancholy to dwell upon. It muſt be manifeſt to all who have eyes to obſerve, or minds to reflect. Let any man deliberately compare the congregations attending other places of worſhip, with thoſe uſually found under the eſtabliſhed means of inſtruction, in the Town, or in the Country: Let him view the *progreſſively and rapidly encreaſing* number of *Sectariſts* on the one hand, and of *careleſs and irreligious* perſons on the other, and he will perceive, that, on this ratio continued, theſe two claſſes of people united will ſoon form a majority of the nation, and of courſe be poſſeſſed of a preponderancy of influence: Let him reflect that however heterogeneous

(d) See Biſhop of Cheſter's Ch. p. 10, 11. (e) Ibid. p. 14.
(f) See the Report, &c. of Lincoln, p. 6, 7, and paſſim; and his Lordſhip's Ch. p. 17, 18. (g) See Note (c) (d) (f.)

the other ſentiments of this coaleſced body might be, they would certainly agree in thinking our maintenance a burden proper to be removed: Let him conſider the natural tendency of ſuch principles, either in a religious or political point of view, and how perſons of this deſcription have uniformly acted, when poſſeſſed of power, at home and abroad: Let any unprejudiced perſon carefully weigh together theſe facts and circumſtances, and it will appear to him not leſs certain than demonſtration itſelf, that *on the preſent plan of teaching in the Church*, ſhe cannot long be ſupported, but that Church, Conſtitution, and all that diſtinguiſhes us from our diſtracted neighbours, muſt be loſt.

3. It is ſurely then high time to inveſtigate the cauſes of this deplorable ſtate of things; it is high time to inquire after the beſt poſſible remedy for it. And both the one and the other are immediately connected with the ſubject under conſideration. There is the very beſt grounded reaſon for believing, that *one principal cauſe* of this low ſtate of religion in the eſtabliſhed Church, is, the *neglect of her genuine doctrines*; and that the moſt *effectual remedy* for the evil would be, a *faithful and earneſt inculcation of theſe doctrines*, by her Miniſters. For,

Firſt, The neglect of theſe doctrines in the Church, is the expreſs reaſon aſſigned for their recourſe to other means, by that large claſs of Semi-Diſſenters who now occupy the greateſt public attention [h]. A faithful promulgation of theſe doctrines by the regular Clergy would therefore remove the very foundation of their diſſent from ſuch perſons; deprive them, on their own principles, of all plauſible excuſe for this conduct; and if it failed of ſucceſs in reſtoring to order and conſiſtency thoſe who have acquired habits of irregularity, it would diveſt others of a ſimilar reaſon for following their example. But with what hope of ſucceſs can we exhort our pariſhioners to adhere firmly to the good old religion of their

(h) See Note (v) above, p. 340; Mr. Weſley's Writings; the Antijacobin Review, May, 1799, p. 76; &c.

forefathers, if this is not done by ourſelves? Who will regard our remonſtrances reſpecting their violation of the diſcipline of the church, while we depart from her doctrines? In vain, with the great bulk of religioniſts, will be our higheſt encomiums upon our excellent Liturgy, if the ſame ſpirit and ſentiments are not viſible in our Sermons. No: If we do not adhere faithfully to the doctrines of the Church, we compel thoſe who do adhere to them to be Diſſenters. But it will have more weight with many perſons, to obſerve

Next, That, both as it regards Sectariſts and careleſs people, the diſeaſe and the remedy, our propoſition is ſupported by the moſt eminent Divines and Prelates of the eſtabliſhed church The reaſon, in Mr. Jones' judgment, why "Goſpel preachers ariſe and abound, who have no authority to teach the people," is, becauſe it is too generally known againſt our preachers, that *they neglect the goſpel*, and take what they call good natural religion into the pulpit." "This," he conceives, "is juſtly thought to be a great and crying abuſe [i]."

"Many well-meaning Chriſtians of this time," proceeds Biſhop Horne, "thirſt after this doctrine, and think they have heard nothing, unleſs they have heard of *Salvation by Jeſus Chriſt*, which is what we properly call *the Goſpel*; and if they do not hear it in the diſcourſes from our Pulpits, where they expect to hear it, they are *tempted to wander in ſearch of it to other places of worſhip*.... And it muſt not be concealed, that, by delivering cold inanimate Lectures on moral virtue, independent of Chriſtianity, many of our Clergy of late years have loſt themſelves very much in the eſtimation of the religious part of the laity [k]."

"To improve the people effectually," Archbiſhop Secker addreſſing his Clergy, adds, "you muſt be aſſiduous in teaching the principles... of the Goſpel, and of the goſpel not as almoſt explained away by modern refiners, but as it is

(i) See above, p. 35. (k) Ch. p. 13; and above, p. 40.

taught by the Church."... "The truth," he says, "I fear, is, that many if not most of us have dwelt too little on these doctrines in our sermons;..the *effect has been lamentable.*' Our people have grown less and less mindful, first of the distinguishing articles of their creed, then, as will always be the case of that one which they hold in common with the heathens... Reflections have been made upon us ... on account of these things, by Deists, Papists, Brethren of our own [l], &c." This Prelate's opinion, in respect to Sectaries, appears in our Title-page, one part of which, time has certainly proved well founded.

The Bishop of London exhorts his Clergy in a strain perfectly to the same effect; cautioning them of the inefficacy of mere "moral essays;" assuring them that the great evangelical doctrines can alone produce the effects desired; and urging them to press these doctrines upon their hearers with the utmost earnestness [m].

Bishop Horsley conceives, that the progress of Infidelity and Sectaries would be more effectually stopped, were it not for the influence of some "erroneous and pernicious maxims which have very much governed the conduct of the Clergy in the ministration of the Word, and much contributed to divest our Sermons of the genuine spirit and savour of Christianity, and to reduce them to mere moral essays [n]." This style of preaching his Lordship therefore reprobates, and recommends, with all his might, as promising good effects the most extensive, a more evangelical doctrine [o]. "This doctrine," he says on another occasion, having mentioned the plain doctrine of our Articles and Homilies, "will always find its way to the hearts of those that shall be saved, and bear down all opposition, internal or external, of the carnal man. But if, instead of thus preaching Christ, you are content to preach only Socrates or Seneca; if, instead of the Everlasting Gospel of the Living

(l) See above, p. 36. (m) Ibid. p. 37. (n) Ibid. p. 39.
(o) See below, p. 416, and Ch. passim.

God, you preach some extract only of your own, accommodated by a bold retrenchment of mysteries, to the blindness and the pride of human reason: depend upon it, animated enthusiasm will be an overmatch for dry frigid Ethics; Superstition will be an overmatch for all such mutilated Gospels; and crafty Atheism, taking advantage of the extravagance of the first, the insipidity of the second, the enormities of the third, and of the rash concessions of half-believers, will make an easy conquest of them all [z]."

The Bishop of Durham assigns his "reasons for thinking, that the growth of Scepticism and Infidelity in the Christian world, is to be ascribed to an almost universal lukewarmness and indifference in Christians, respecting the essentials of their religion, the peculiar grounds of their faith, of their hopes, and their fears;" and "upon the most diligent view of the subject," is "persuaded," that one of four causes to which "that lukewarmness in religion is, in a great measure, to be ascribed, is, An infrequency in the Pulpit of those subjects which constitute the *peculiar doctrines* of Christianity [p]."

On this evil, his Lordship also, like his Brethren, particularly expatiates, and labours with all his eloquence and zeal for its removal. "All," he observes, pleading with those who do not preach evangelically enough, "that distinguishes Christianity from other religions is doctrinal: a Christian's hopes and consolations, his obligations and motives, are doctrinal points; the very means and end of his salvation, the main objects of his most earnest contention, are all the points of faith and doctrine. Divest then Christianity of its faith and doctrines, and you despoil it of all that is peculiar to it in its motives, its consolations, its sanctions, and its duties [q]." And on another occasion, "In the *peculiar* doctrines of Christianity," he proceeds, "are we to look for the topics which have the strongest hold on the affections; which most interest our hopes and our fears.... The doc-

(z) Ch. 1800. p. 31. (p) Above, p. 42. (q) Ch. 1791, p. 17.

trines which diſtinguiſh a Chriſtian from a Jew, Mahometan, or an Heathen, ſhould be a Chriſtian's conſtant ſtudy; and as it is your duty to teach, what it is every man's concern to know, it is incumbent upon you to preſent them frequently to your congregations, to impreſs them on their minds with all the energy which you can derive from language, with all the affection which they are calculated to inſpire[r]."—There is however higher authority than even this of our great Divines and Biſhops for the opinion we are maintaining.

It is alſo manifeſt from the WORD OF GOD, and the reaſon of the thing. Our commiſſion is to "preach the goſpel[s]." It is "the preaching of the croſs," it is "the goſpel of Chriſt," which "is the power of God unto ſalvation[t]." Theſe are the eſpecial means which God has appointed for the reformation and recovery of mankind from ſin and death. Theſe only therefore he can be expected to bleſs. The doctrines peculiar to this divine ſcheme are alſo, above all others, in their own nature, wonderfully adapted to this bleſſed end. "The practice of religion," Biſhop Horſley obſerves, "will always thrive, in proportion as its doctrines are generally underſtood and firmly received; and the practice will degenerate and decay, in proportion as the doctrine is miſunderſtood and neglected.... The motives which the revealed doctrines furniſh, "are the only motives a preacher of the Goſpel has to do with, and the only motives by which religious duty can be *effectually* enforced[v]." "Let me," ſays Biſhop Pretyman, to his Clergy, "particularly recommend to you, to make the Doctrines of Chriſtianity the conſtant baſis of moral inſtruction, as no other ground can give ſecurity to human virtue[w]."

(r) Ch. 1797, p. 22. (s) Mark xvi. 15; and Ordination Sermon. (t) Rom. i. 16; and 1 Cor. i. 18. (v) Ch. p. 8. (w) Ch. p. 14.

It was with principles, precepts, and motives derived from this ſource, that the firſt Ambaſſadors of the Redeemer went forth into a world lying in wickedneſs, and produced ſuch aſtoniſhing effects. It was "the croſs of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt," which formed the grand object of the great Apoſtle's glorying, and which became the effectual means of his ſanctification [x]. It was "Jeſus Chriſt and him crucified," which St. Paul ſo ſtedfaſtly determined to make the grand ſubject of his preaching, and, in compariſon of which, to know nothing elſe [y]. And, his declaration to the Galatians is applicable to others, in proportion as they either intermix with, or ſubſtitute in the ſtead of, this goſpel, any thing whatever. "Behold, I Paul ſay unto you, that if ye be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing.... Chriſt is become of no effect unto you, whoſoever of you are juſtified by the law [z]."

Could therefore the moſt perfect acquaintance with natural religion, the underſtanding of a Newton, the eloquence of a Demoſthenes, and the zeal of a Martyr, centre in one Miniſter of our church, no truly ſaving and ſanctifying effects could be expected from his exertions, if the name and offices of the Son of God were deſpiſed or omitted. Whatever elſe ſuch a preacher might achieve, he would certainly never reconcile one ſinner to God, change one heart, or fit one individual for the true ſpiritual worſhip of God here, and the enjoyments of heaven hereafter. And the effect muſt be proportionally bad when theſe great doctrines of "our moſt holy faith" are only admitted in general terms, and not frequently and ſpecifically enforced.

And as, under theſe circumſtances, none but an evangelical ſtrain of preaching can reaſonably be expected to have

(x) Gal. vi. 14. (y) 1 Cor. ii 2. (z) Chap. v. 2, 4.

any proper influence in promoting true religion in the world, so it is also found to be the case,

By the *experience of fact*. These doctrines, it has appeared, have in all ages of the Christian church been most successful in effecting the reformation of individuals, and of bodies of men; this mode of teaching arrests the attention, and influences the conduct, beyond every other at the present time[a]. Its superior popularity is on all hands admitted[b]; and to every unprejudiced observer its superior moral efficacy must also be manifest. Wherever the genuine doctrines of our Church are faithfully and discreetly inculcated by her Ministers, there is seldom wanting a crowded attendance upon them, and some other visible good effects of their labours: Wherever these doctrines are notoriously neglected, there, almost invariably, will be found, a greater number of one description of persons, who seek such doctrines elsewhere, and of another description, who neglect public worship altogether.

And, the very objection to this style of preaching which is justly thought most plausible, is neither founded in reason nor in wisdom, but really furnishes a strong argument for its encouragement. Whatever, it is argued, be its effect in any parish while it is continued, it indispose persons for every less evangelical mode of instruction, and therefore has certainly, in some cases, been attended with consequences detrimental to the church, on its removal from such place. But, is it a proper reason why one Minister should neglect

(a) See above p. 306—328. (b) See above, p. 388, 389. "Nothing can be more notorious," says the Antijacobin Review, "than that the kingdom is divided almost between Methodists and Deists. If we look into any town, almost in England, and examine the religious creeds of its inhabitants, we shall find that the thinking (or rather half-thinking) gentry are Deists or Socinians, some professedly, others secretly; that the *majority* of the middle classes are Calvinistic or Arminian Methodists, and that *three parts* of the lowest orders are Methodists." June 1801. p. 187.

his *own plain duty* becauſe his Succeſſor may poſſibly neglect *his?* Do any perſons reject the bleſſings of ſeaſons of plenty, becauſe they may be followed by years of deficiency and dearth? Would it be wiſdom in the preſent time of general ſcarcity to repreſs the exertions of thoſe who by their extraordinary attention to agriculture contribute moſt to the ſupplies of their neighbourhood? The evil is wholly chargeable on thoſe who deſert the true doctrines of the church, who introduce the taſteleſs fare of Ariſtotle in the room of the rich proviſion of Chriſt: And the only proper and adequate remedy would be, the very conduct we are recommending, that *all Miniſters* ſhould preach evangelically, that their flocks ſhould uniformly be fed on that "feaſt of fat things" which is made "for all people [c].

Such good reaſon is there for aſcribing the preſent bad ſtate of our Church, in a great degree, to the neglect of her peculiar doctrines; ſuch ſtrong ground is there for believing that a proper attention to theſe doctrines would be the moſt effectual means of effecting her recovery.

4. Our ſubject then is certainly important. It is not a light matter whether we "continue in the things which we have learned [d]," and inculcate them on others, or whether we comply with modern innovations. The points for which we contend reſpect the very life of practical Chriſtianity: They are connected with the happineſs of individuals, the preſervation of our Church, and the ſalvation of our Country. The preaching of the true doctrines of the Eſtabliſhment, is at once a duty to which we are ſolemnly bound, and a conduct of all others the moſt promiſing of general good. The propagation of the genuine goſpel among men, is the grand method by which we muſt check the progreſs of infidelity and licentiouſneſs, heal the breaches of our

(c) Iſaiah xxv. (d) 2 Tim. iii. 14.

Zion, move the land to repentance, appeaſe the wrath of an offended God, and avert the judgments which are deſolating the reſt of the world.

"Vital Chriſtianity," we confeſs, "is our grand panacea [e]." This we dare indeed "boldly preſcribe," as the moſt ſovereign remedy "for the moral and political diſorders of ſociety [f];" it is "the leaves of the tree of life for the healing of the nations [g]:" This is the leaven we would infuſe into the whole maſs of mankind [h]: This is the Salt which, in the name of the Lord, we would caſt into the pernicious waters to render them wholeſome [i]: And thus would we be "The Salt of the earth [k]."

And what happy effects might not be expected would all the "Miniſters of the Altar," apprized of their true ſituation, ſet themſelves in their reſpective departments, by doctrine and example, with zeal and conſiſtency, to propagate the genuine ſpirit and practice of this Divine religion? "I am much miſtaken," ſays Biſhop Horſley, recommending the plain doctrines of our Articles and Homilies, "if a proper diligence on our parts, to inculcate theſe doctrines, which are indeed the very baſis of the Chriſtian ſyſtem, which the Philoſophers of the preſent times explain away, and the illiterate Enthuſiaſt, by the meanneſs of his ſtyle, and the abſurdity of his illuſtrations, too often buleſques; I am miſtaken, if a proper diligence, on our part, to inculcate theſe doctrines, would not ſoon ſuperſede the neceſſity of all controverſy. Truth, deeply planted in the public mind, would keep poſſeſſion by its own native ſtrength; the common people, made proficients in the Faith, however in other reſpects illiterate, and accuſtomed to the doctrine originally delivered to the Saints, would turn with horror from every thing of a contrary ſound. Nouriſhed with the ſin-

(e) See the Monthly Review for July 1797, p. 247. (f) Ibid. (g) Rev. xxii. 2. (h) Mat. xiii. 33. (i) 2 Kings ii. 19—22. (k) Mat. v. 13.

cere milk of the word, by their proper paſtors, they would refuſe a drink of doubtful quality, mingled by a ſtranger. In a word, our churches would be thronged; while the Moralizing Unitarian would be left to read his dull weekly lecture to the walls of his deſerted conventicle; and the Field-Preacher would bellow unregarded to the wilderneſs [l]."

This is perhaps expecting too much. The caſe may have become too inveterate to admit of ſo complete a cure. Our utmoſt however ſhould be done. We ſhould remove all juſt cauſe of complaint againſt us from Sectaries; we ſhould obey the admonitions of our Prelates; we ſhould impart the meſſage entruſted to us; we ſhould adopt meaſures which experience proves the moſt efficacious; we ſhould deliver our own ſouls. If this method of proceeding fails of ſucceſs, little is it to be expected from any other. In vain ſhall we have recourſe to *penal laws*. Theſe can never effect any thing *radical* in religion, and are peculiarly ill ſuited to the caſt of the preſent times. If we would really preſerve our people from other teachers, we muſt preach to them a doctrine ſuited to their neceſſities; we muſt convince them by unremitted aſſiduity and attention, that no perſons are ſo much concerned for their ſalvation: If we would preſerve them from infidelity, we muſt ſhow them, by our whole deportment, that we believe ourſelves what we teach to others: If we would ſee them true Chriſtians, we muſt be "an example of the believers, in word, in converſation, in charity, in ſpirit, in faith, in purity [m]."

In ſhort, if, in theſe times, we would ſupport the credit of our Order, we muſt "renounce the hidden things of diſhoneſty, not walking in craftineſs, nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but, by manifeſtation of the truth, commend ourſelves to every man's conſcience, in the ſight of

---

(l) Ch. p. 29. (m) 1 Tim. iv. 12.

God [n]:" We must "take heed unto ourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made us overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood [o]:" We must "give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine;" must "meditate on the things" which concern our profession, and "give ourselves *wholly* to them.... In doing this, we shall both save ourselves and them that hear us [p]."

And what motives can be wanting to awaken our vigilance, and stimulate our zeal to the uttermost? How solemnly are we warned by the fate of other careless Churches? We have seen their "candlestick removed [q]," and darkness and wretchedness unparallelled succeeeding; and similar causes, we know, will infallibly produce similar effects. The whole history of God's providential government, in respect to bodies of people and nations, is a commentary upon his declaration, "Them that honour me I will honour; and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed [r]." Yea, although the King's house of Judah is as "Gilead unto God," and "Coniah were the signet upon his right hand,... yet surely," on its "iniquity being full," "will he pluck him thence," make him as a "broken Idol," and his land as a "wilderness [s]."

And can we then, without the greatest solicitude, behold the growing progress of irreligion, licentiousness, dissipation, and faction, in this our nation? Can we witness the rapid advances of those principles and vices, which, at once, provoke the Divine displeasure, and lead, in the natural course of things, to its execution, and *not do our utmost* to check and repress them? Where then is either our boasted churchmanship or patriotism? How different was the Apostle's regard for his country, who "could wish that himself were

(n) 2 Cor. iv. 2. (o) Acts xx. 28. (p) 1 Tim. iv. 13—16.
(q) Revela. ii. 5. (r) 1 Sam. ii. 30. (s) Jeremiah xxii. 6, 24.

accurſed from Chriſt, for his brethren, his kinſmen, according to the fleſh [t]?" Nay, where is our regard for ourſelves, for the welfare of our own body? Can we read God's awful denunciations againſt thoſe "Watchmen who ſee the ſword come upon the land, and blow not the trumpet [v];" can we ſee the divine threatenings executed, and the Miniſters of ſo many churches actually "made contemptible and baſe before all the people [w]," "fed with wormwood and drinking the waters of Gall [x]," for having "corrupted the covenant of Levi," and "been *partial* in the law [y];" can we at the ſame time really *feel* a growing neglect of our Sacred Order, and not inſtitute a ſtrict inquiry into our own conduct, and not tremble for our own ſafety, if we are really unfaithful?

There are however conſiderations to be kept in view, infinitely more weighty than any thing of a merely temporal nature; conſiderations, in compariſon of which, even the revolutions of Kingdoms ſhrink into inſignificancy. The grand object of the Redeemer, in his aſtoniſhing undertaking, was, to ſave the *ſouls* of men; to reſcue them from miſery, and provide for them a happineſs, in reſpect to an *everlaſting ſtate*. The grand object of our Commiſſion, is, "ſo to prepare and make ready his way, by turning the hearts of the diſobedient to the wiſdom of the juſt, that at his ſecond coming to judge the world, we may be found an acceptable people in his ſight [z]." The World, and all its glories, are paſſing away like a ſhadow. This ſolemn ſeaſon is faſt approaching. And then muſt each of us give a ſtrict account of our ſtewardſhips. Then will it be found, that both our own, and the everlaſting condition of our people, have been intimately connected with our miniſterial conduct. And what a momentous reſponſibility

(t) Rom. ix. 3. (v) Ezekiel xxxiii 6. (w) Malachi ii. 9.
(x) Jer xxiii. 15. (y) Ibid. (z) Coll. third Sunday in Advent.

do these considerations attach to our office! How solicitous should this make us, both that our doctrines may be sound, and our diligence unwearied; that we may neither "pervert[a]," nor by any means "hinder the gospel of Christ[b];" that we may be "unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish;" "not as many, which corrupt the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God may speak in Christ[c]."

How should we "watch for men's souls, as they that must give an account[d]." What caution should we use "lest that by any means when we have preached to others, we ourselves should be cast-aways[e]." What a preponderating object of our ambition should it be, that when our course is finishing, and we say to our people, "Ye shall see my face no more," we may be able to add, amidst their affectionate "sorrowings,"—"Ye know how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you: I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God: I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men[f]."

Well may we, on this view of our situation, earnestly inquire, with the Apostle, "Who is sufficient for these things[g]?" and importunately solicit the aid of God. Well may we, under these impressions, and a sight of the world around us, feelingly exclaim with Moses, "O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end[h]!" Well may we address them in the solemn language of the weeping Prophet, "O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord[i]!" Well may we "beseech" sinners in God's name, "and pray them in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God[k]."

(a) Gal. i. 7. (b) 1 Cor. ix. 12. (c) 2 Cor. ii 15, 17. (d) Heb. xiii. 17. (e) 1 Cor. 9. 27. (f) Acts xx. 20, 25—27, 38. (g) 2 Cor. ii. 16. (h) Deut. xxxii. 29. (i) Jer. xxii. 29. (k) 2 Cor. v. 20.

But, are we "the Meſſengers of the Lord of Hoſts [l]," the Ambaſſadors of that Saviour who left the glories of heaven, and laid down his life for the ſalvation of men, and can we make a *light matter* of our office, and be careleſs about the execution of it? How deplorably then do we betray our truſt; how regardleſs are we of the honour of our Divine Maſter; how devoid are we of love for him! Have we deliberately taken upon us the Cure of the immortal ſouls of our reſpective pariſhes? And do we "entangle ourſelves with the affairs of this life," or make it the leading object of our profeſſion to obtain worldly honour and advantage? Can we calmly think of any who have been committed to our care, living and dying in ſin, and ignorance, and impenitence, and periſhing everlaſtingly, through our fault? Where then are our "bowels and mercies" for our fellow creatures, where is our philanthropy, where our common humanity? Surely our hearts muſt be like adamant, and our cruelty unparalleled.

While therefore, on the one hand, we juſtly felicitate ourſelves on the *dignity* of our Office, as the nobleſt that can poſſibly devolve on mortals; let us remember on the other, that if we can *trifle* with it, our characters are moſt deſpicable.—While, on the one ſide, we contemplate the moſt glorious reward awaiting the faithful diſcharge of our duty; let us, on the other, learn from the whole tenour of ſcripture, that if we are unfaithful we ſhall of *all men be moſt miſerable.*—While, on the one hand, our exertions are animated with the conſideration that "they who turn many to righteouſneſs ſhall ſhine as the ſtars for ever and ever [m];" may we, on the other, be ever ſuitably affected with ſuch paſſages as the following:—"Son of man, I have ſet thee a Watchman unto the houſe of Iſrael; therefore thou ſhalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me. When I ſay unto

(l) Mal. ii. 7. (m) Dan. xii. 3.

the wicked, O wicked man, thou ſhalt ſurely die; if thou doſt not ſpeak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man ſhall die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at thine hand [n]." "Though we, or an Angel from heaven, preach any other goſpel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accurſed [o]." "If I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: but if againſt my will, a diſpenſation of the goſpel is committed unto me; . . . neceſſity is laid upon me; yea, Wo is unto me, if I preach not the goſpel [p]."

(n) Ezek. xxxiii. 7, 8. (o) Gal. i. 8. (p) 1 Cor. ix. 16, 17.

THE END.

Printed at the Office of
T. WILSON and R. SPENCE,
High-Ouſegate, York.

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS
WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH DAY AND TO $1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY OVERDUE.

MAY 19 1944

6-15
July 15

5Jan51CDV

NOV 5 1953 LD

23Apr'58LT
Edwards
MAY 23 1958

REC'D LD
MAY 26 1953

REC'D LD
APR 26 1962

23Nov'62B3

REC'D LD
NOV 26 1962

9 JAN '64 CT

REC'D LD
DEC 17 '63 -5 PM

LD 21-10m-5,'43(6061s)

YB 30743

27672

BX5131
D8

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY